Historia Renarrata:
Early Benedictine Revisions of the First Crusade

University of Turku
School of History, Culture and Arts Studies
Cultural History

Master's thesis

Lauri Härkänen

September 2012

TURUN YLIOPISTO
Historian, kulttuurin ja taiteiden tutkimuksen laitos / Humanistinen tiedekunta

HÄRKÄNEN, LAURI: Historia Renarrata: Early Benedictine Revisions of the First Crusade

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 120 s.
Kulttuurihistoria
Syyskuu 2012

Tutkimukseni käsittelee ensimmäisen ristiretken (1095–1101) varhaista latinankielistä historiankirjoitusta. Tarkastelun keskiössä ovat kolmen benediktiinimunkin historiateokset, jotka perustuvat anonyymin kirjoittajan silminnäkijäkertomukseen nimeltä *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*. Benediktiinit ilmoittivat pyrkineensä ennen kaikkea korjaamaan kyseisen teoksen tyyliä. Samalla he kuitenkin tulivat tuottaneeksi varsin erilaista kuvaa ristiretkestä ja ristiritarista.

Tutkimuksessani tarkastelen yksityiskohtaisesti ja eri versioita vertaillen sitä, miten ristiretken historiaa kirjoitettiin ja uudelleenkirjoitettiin. Mitä kohtia munkit pyrkivät muuttamaan, miten he sen tekivät ja miksi? Kiinnitän huomioni teoksissa käytettyyn retoriikkaan sekä siihen mitä jätettiin kertomatta. Oletetun lukijan käsitettä hyödyntäen pohdin myös teosten mahdollista ja todennäköistä kohdeyleisöä – siis sitä, kenelle historiaa ensimmäisestä ristiretkestä kirjoitettiin.

Ensimmäistä ristiretkeä koskevat käsityksemme perustuvat suuressa määrin tarkastelemiini kertomuksiin ja niiden toisintoihin. Ilman lähteiden retorista analyysiä ja kontekstualisointia monet faktoina pitämämme tulkinnat uhkaavat kuitenkin osoittautua hiekkarakennelmiksi. Tutkimuksessani korostan toisaalta silminnäkijäkertomusten ja uudelleenkirjoitusten välisiä eroja, toisaalta sitä, että myös uudelleentulkintojen välillä oli huomattavia eroavuuksia. Tästä syystä on tärkeää, että ristiretkeä koskevat ajatukset ankkuroidaan lähteisiinsä, eikä yleistyksiä viedä liian pitkälle.

Yhteistä näille kertomuksille on se, että ne kuvasivat menneisyyttä omasta ajastaan käsin ilman pyrkimystä menneisyyden tavoittamiseksi ”niin kuin se oikeasti oli”. Tutkimukseni osoittaa, että ensimmäisen ristiretken aikalaiskertomukset ovat tiettyjen tarkoitusperien vuoksi tuotettuja retorisia tekstejä, joita ei tulisi arvioida faktuaalisen totuuskäsityksen kautta. Ne kertovat meille vain vähän siitä, mitä oikeasti tapahtui, mutta varsin paljon siitä, miten tapahtunut ymmärrettiin ja miten se haluttiin esittää.

Asiasanat
keskiaika, ristiretket, historiankirjoitus, kirjallinen kulttuuri, benediktiinit, soturi-ideaalit, ritarit, kristinusko, paavi, pyhä sota, frankit

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 Subject

This is a study about rewriting the history of the First Crusade. The crusade was an armed expedition to Asia Minor conducted by western Christians. It was launched in November 1095 at Clermont by Pope Urban II, after which the participants set forth gradually in the next year. Despite tremendous difficulties during the journey, the crusaders[1] succeeded in capturing several major cities, including Nicaea and Antioch. The expedition culminated in the conquest of Jerusalem in July 1099 and the subsequent victory over the Fatimid army at Ascalon.[2] Militarily the crusade was a great success. Yet, in the contemporary thinking, it was regarded essentially as a religious victory over both the inner enemy of the Devil and the outer enemy of Islam. For the participants, the expedition was an enormous accomplishment – an exploit worthy of celebration and commemoration. Likewise, the supporters of the reformer papacy saw the expedition as a demonstration of the papal leadership of Christendom.[3] It is therefore no wonder that many, participants and non-participants alike, wrote their accounts of these extraordinary events.

Chronicles focusing on a single event were nevertheless relatively uncommon in the twelfth century. Most of the narratives of the age either described the great deeds (*gesta*) of kings, monasteries, or particular people. Another line of tradition was to narrate the past as a part of the universal, providential history.[4] The crusade histories apparently drew on all these elements and merged them into a new kind of sub-genre: that of a spectacular event.[5] They all described the exemplary deeds of "great men". Most of them tried to set the narrative into a meaningful context by grounding it to other historical narratives – not least the Bible. Some, moreover, sought a deeper meaning for the event by employing the exegetical interpretations upon it. Still, the question of writing and rewriting the history of the First Crusade has been given relatively little

[1] In the contemporary language, the participants were not called "crusaders". Latin word *crucesignatus*, from which the vernacular terms are derived, established its later meaning gradually towards the turn of the century. For this, see Markowski 1984, 157–164. The participants were mostly referred as "soldiers of Christ", "pilgrims", "Franks", or "Jerosolimites". On these terms, see Chapters 4.1 and 4.2 in this study.
[2] For general studies about the First Crusade, see the concise histories of Madden 1999 and Riley-Smith 1987, the influential works of Mayer 1988 (1965) and Runciman 1980 (1951), as well as those of Baldwin (ed.) 1969 (1955), and Tyerman 2006. For a military history, see France 1994. Chronological and narrative outlines along with short biographies about the authors and the main characters can be found in Lock (ed.) 2006.
[3] On the legacy and remembrance of the crusade, see concisely Phillips 2007, 17–35; more profoundly, Packard 2011, passim.
[4] Rubenstein 2005, 180. For an overview of the non-crusade historiography of the age, see Classen 1982, 387–417.
[5] Packard 2011, 53–54.

attention. In my thesis, I am attempting to contribute to this shortcoming.

The main objective of this study is to provide a comparative and critical analysis of three narratives compiled within a decade after the fall of Jerusalem. These are Baldric of Bourgueil's *Historia Jerosolimitana*, Guibert of Nogent's *Dei Gesta per Francos*, and Robert the Monk's *Historia Iherosolimitana*.[6] All the authors wrote within the Benedictine monastic community, and they all explicitly proclaimed to rework an earlier history of the expedition – an anonymous text which we now know as *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum*.[7] This context, and the issues involved, will be discussed in detail later in this introduction. The main question under consideration is twofold. Firstly, what did the monks change in their main source? Which parts or interpretations of the story they deemed acceptable and which not? Secondly, how were these texts written, and how were the alterations carried out?

My primary method has been to read all the versions side by side and to compare them in relation to their main source. This approach enables me to discern the interpolations, digressions, omissions, and emendations in the narratives. Furthermore, any analysis of alterations should be followed by the question of purposes of committing. That is to ask, why were the revisions produced in the first place? In this regard, it is extremely important to investigate the intended audiences, that is, for whom

---

[6] Baldric of Bourgueil. *Historia Jerosolimitana*. RHC Occ. vol. 4, pp. 1–111. [Henceforth "BB"]; Guibert of Nogent. *Historia quae inscribitur Dei gesta per Francos*. Corp. Christ. Cont. Med. CXXVII A. Ed. by R. B. C. Huygens (1996) [Henceforth "GN"]; see also an earlier edition in RHC Occ. vol. 4, pp. 113–263; Guibert's work is translated by R. Levine as *The Deeds of God through the Franks* (2008, orig. 1997); Robert of Rheims. *Historia Iherosolimitana*. RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. 717–882 [Henceforth "RM"]; Robert's chronicle is translated by C. Sweetenham as *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* (2005).

All references to the primary sources are made respectively to book (capital roman number), chapter (lowcase Roman number), and line/subsection (Arabic number). These are separated with a period. Whenever necessary and relevant, also the page number is given in brackets. Note that if the number is not bracketed, in most cases, it refers to line/subsection and not to page. Direct quotations in original texts are indicated with italics. Yet, if the allusion is indirect or quoted incorrectly, the italics are not used. Whenever the italics are used in order to mark an emphasis, it will be noted. For all the translations in this study, I have used the versions that are referred alongside the editions, if available. Yet, whenever I have not agreed with their interpretations, I have more or less modified them, either with an aid of the earlier translations or according to my own judgement. If the given translation is entirely from a single work, it will be indicated. References to the Bible are compared with the Vulgate (according to the Clementine Vulgate Project). Biblical translations are mostly taken from Douay-Rheims Bible and not the King James version because the former follows most accurately the text and composition of the Vulgate. If, however, the King James translation is more accurate, I have preferred it instead. The composition of the Vulgate differs from the King James Bible and most of the modern versions in respect to the book/chapter/verse division. Therefore, the given passage of the Vulgate does not always correspond with that of the later edition.

[7] Edited and translated by R. Hill as *The Deeds of The Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem* (1962) [Henceforth "GF"]. The edition includes also Latin text, which is prepared by Roger Mynors. It is based on *Vatican Reginensis lat. 572*, which Mynors claims to be "the earliest and most authentic of the seven manuscripts known to survive", see p. xxxviii. It is also the edition most frequently cited by the scholars. Another modern edition worth mentioning is *Anonymi gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum. Mit Erläuterungen herausgegeben von Heinrich Hagenmeyer* (1890).

were the narratives written? In order to answer these questions, I will analyse the use of language and the rhetoric employed in the texts. Aside from comparing the particular narratives, I also hope to contribute to the understanding of the twelfth-century historical writing as well as the discourse on the purposes of history and the nature of historical knowledge more generally.

The disposition of this study is thematical. I will discuss the questions throughout my study, approaching them from different points of view. In the first chapter, the revision of the story is treated in general terms. I will discuss the questions of historiographical perceptions and style, as well as their bearings on the narratives; then, in the next section, the meanings and the legitimation which the authors gave to the expedition as a whole. The remaining two chapters address particular themes which the Benedictines sought to promote. The first of these was authority. Under this topic, I will discuss the alleged papal initiative and the leadership of the crusading army. The final chapter covers three different yet overlapping images considering the crusaders and crusading. First, I will examine the Benedictine ideal of a new kind of Christian warrior, then their perceptions of national identities, and finally the endeavour to picture the crusaders as epic heroes.

1.2 Sources and Contexts

Several contemporary or almost contemporary narratives of the First Crusade remain to the present day. One of the earliest accounts was written by Raymond of Aguilers, a canon of Le Puy who accredited as his co-author a certain knight known as Pons of Balazun.[8] It is not clear however, what the specific role of this collaborator might have been, as he died before the army reached Jerusalem.[9] On the crusade, Raymond accompanied the leader of the Provençal army, Count of Toulouse, who also was named Raymond.[10] Another early account was written by Fulcher of Chartres, initially chaplain of Stephen of Blois, who during the journey changed allegiance to Baldwin of Boulogne (who later succeeded his brother Godfrey as the ruler of Jerusalem).[11] Both of these narratives may have been brought out in the very first years of the century. Raymond

[8] Raymond of Aguilers. *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*. RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. 231–309 [From now on cited as "RA"]. The work has been translated by J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (1968).
[9] RA (235); Rubenstein 2005, 197–198, esp. n. 97; Hill & Hill 1968, 15 n. 1.
[10] For basic information about the persons mentioned in this study, see Lock (ed.) 2006. Very little is known about Raymond, see Hill & Hill 1968, 6–8.
[11] Fulcher of Chartres. *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127). Mit Erläuterungen und einem Anhange herausgegeben von Heinrich Hagenmeyer* (1913) [Henceforth "FC"]. See also an earlier edition in RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. 311–485; Fulcher's chronicle has been translated as *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095–1127* by F. R. Ryan. Ed. by H. S. Fink (1973). For a biography of Fulcher, see Hagenmeyer 1913, 1–18; and Epp 1990, 24–44.

finished his work at the latest by 1105.[12] Fulcher wrote the first redaction of his narrative between 1101 and 1106 but then continued and amended the text in numerous phases until his death in 1128.[13]

These, however, were not the first accounts to appear, for they made notable use of some earlier source, common to both writers. Traditionally, the scholars have thought that this was the *Gesta Francorum*, but the relationship between these early narratives is not necessarily so uncomplicated, as will be explained below.[14] All the aforementioned were eyewitness accounts. Before long, also non-eyewitnessing histories of the crusade appeared. First three of these were written by the aforementioned Benedictine monks – Baldric, Guibert and Robert. They all set about to correct an earlier history of the crusade, which, due to the textual similarities, cannot have been much dissimilar to the *Gesta Francorum*. None of these three monks had participated in the expedition, and they all claimed to correct mainly the style and composition of the earlier narrative.[15] As I attempt to demonstrate in this study, the Benedictines did not content themselves with the formalities but instead revised the story into something very different.

The contexts of these three revisions share considerable similarities. Each author came from the northern France; Baldric was abbot of the Abbey of St Peter at Bourgueil, and had been elected as archbishop of Dol in 1107; Guibert had been abbot of Nogent-sous-Coucy in Île de France since 1104; and Robert was a monk of St Rémi in Rheims.[16] Both Robert and Guibert claim to have written by a request.[17] It is uncertain however by whom, if any, the chronicles were truly commissioned. Robert claims that he wrote for a certain abbot (either "Bernardus", "Benedictus", "B" or "N" – depending on the manuscript).[18] Guibert, on the other hand, dedicated his work to Bishop Lysiard of Soisson. Similarly, Baldric devoted his chronicle to an abbot, Peter of Maillezais.[19] Yet, the dedicatee of a history was not necessarily the patron of its author,

---

[12] France 1998a, 41–43; Hill & Hill 1968, 7; Kangas 2007, 37 n. 135.
[13] Fink 1973, 18–24; Hagenmeyer 1913, 12, 42–48; Kangas 2007, 38–39. France 1998a, 42, 58, suggest 1101 but he does not give reasons for this an early date. Be it as it may, he approves that Fulcher used Raymond and is thus later than this. This relationship has been examined in Hagenmeyer 1913, 65–70.
[14] For Fulcher's use of Raymond and the *Gesta*, see Hagenmeyer 1913, 65–70. Raymond's relationship to the *Gesta* is discussed below.
[15] For further discussion, see Chapter 2.1.
[16] Traditionally Robert has been associated with the abbot of the same monastery. However, there seems to be no evidence to conclude that it is the same person in question. Yet, it is interesting to note that Baldric supported this abbot when he was excommunicated due to maladministration. See Sweetenham 2005, 3–4; RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. xli–xliii.
[17] GN, praefatio 47–48, "Nec id solo presumptive instictu egi meo, sed sua aliquibus petitione huic adnitentibus fideliter voto."; RM, apologeticus sermo (722), n. 8; Sweetenham 2005, 1–2.
[18] Bull 1996, 39, suggests even that this abbot might have been Baldric; cf. Kraft 1905, 10–11. There is no evidence to deny or prove this hypothesis.
[19] BB, epistolae (5–8).

as Leah Shopkow has noted in a different context.[20] It was but a common practice to dedicate one's work to an authoritative person. Both of these features, the dedication and the reference to obedience, contributed to one's reliability and could therefore be without further substance.[21] It is also probable that Baldric did not write by Peter's request, for he claims to have sought to correct this with his narrative.[22] Thus, we should not presuppose that Lysiard was the commissioner of Guibert's chronicle only because Guibert dedicates his work to him. Together with the problem of identity, this also casts a shadow over Robert's purposes. In short, we simply do not know whether or not the chronicles were truly written by request or commissioned by an order.

All the narratives were written approximately at the same time: Robert finished his work in 1106–1107, Baldric probably around the year 1108, and Guibert definitely in 1109.[23] Although not attested, it seems to be the case that the authors wrote without knowing about each other's works. They made similar alterations to the narrative and constructed parallel interpretations and meanings of the expedition, yet there seems to be no textual correspondences between their works.[24] Nevertheless, it has been suggested that the authors might have shared common politics or guidelines for writing. Jonathan Riley-Smith asserts that these chronicles were written in order to promote a theological treatment of the crusade in accordance to the views of "French Benedictine monastic circles".[25] This view is widely accepted. Yet, as I will argue in the present study, the message of these three chronicles was not entirely homogeneous. Furthermore, it seems to me that they were written, at least partly, for different purposes.[26]

Robert's narrative was by far the most widely distributed of all the crusade narratives. To the present day, it has survived roughly in one hundred manuscripts. In comparison, there are seven manuscripts of the *Gesta*, eight of Guibert, and of Baldric only few more.[27] In addition, the geographical spread of the copies is quite notable.

---

[20] Shopkow 1997, 215.
[21] See Chapter 2.1.
[22] "Libellum quem de Jerosolimitano itinere quoquo modo composui, ad castigandum tibi transmisi: quem regulari censura, volo, compescas et polias; et epistolam hanc cum ipso mihi non irremuneratam remittas." BB, epistola (6).
[23] For dating of Robert's work, see Sweetenham 2005, 7; for Baldric, see RHC Occ. vol. 4, p. vi, n. 5; Kangas 2007, 29, 31; Sweetenham 2005, 7; and for Guibert, Huygens 1996, 51–56.
[24] Sweetenham 2005, 28.
[25] Riley-Smith 1986, 138–139; Sweetenham 2005, 14.
[26] Riley-Smith 1986, 139, wrote that "It is striking that, in spite of natural differences in style and interest, the message that flowed from these three pens was already recognizably one message."
[27] Sweetenham 2005, 8; Bull 1996, 42–43; Packard 2011, 17. In the case of Baldric, the exact number of manuscripts is seven, but Steven Biddlecombe, the author of the forthcoming new edition, has found several formerly unknown manuscripts. Considering Robert's chronicle, there are probably more than one

Furthermore, Robert's chronicle is the only one that got translated into vernacular already in the Middle Ages. It is therefore quite apparent that his version was the most popular of the narratives in question.[28] The chronicles of Robert and Baldric were also later utilised by other historians and had thus some collateral importance beyond their immediate influence. Guibert's narrative, on the other hand, seems to have been hardly read at all by the later authors.[29]

In addition to the *Gesta*, all but Baldric used other sources as well. Robert operated with two main sources, of which the other was most likely an unknown Latin verse chronicle. Roughly a decade later, this unknown source was also used by Gilo of Paris and his anonymous continuator.[30] There are also some minor parallels with Raymond's work, which can mean either that Robert used Raymond's narrative or that there was a common source between these two writers, possibly the now-lost verse chronicle.[31] The parallels between Robert and the vernacular poetic tradition are complex, but the surviving verse cycles considering the crusades are of later date than Robert's chronicle. Therefore, the extant vernacular poetry cannot directly be regarded as his source.[32] Logically, this applies to the other narratives written at the same time as well.

Like Robert, Guibert had probably two main sources. The other of these was an early version of Fulcher's chronicle. Nonetheless, Guibert does not make much use of Fulcher. He claims that he made the acquaintance of it only when he was giving the

---

hundred manuscripts, but the exact number is still unknown to me because the new edition is currently in the making.

[28] Sweetenham 2005, 8–11.

[29] According to Huygens, Guibert's *Gesta Dei per Francos* was not mentioned before the seventeenth century. Robert's narrative was undoubtly the most used of the three: it was widely copied and adapted until the sixteenth century. Baldric's version was employed – besides a number of other authors – for example by Orderic Vitalis who used it, sometimes quoting word for word, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. See Huygens 1996, 16; Sweetenham 2005, 9–11; RHC Occ. vol. 4, p. xiii–xiv; Ray 1974, 55–56. Note, however, that a small number of manuscripts does not directly mean that the book was unimportant. It only indicates that the book in question did not have a wide dissemination. Similarly, a book might have been important as an object even if it was not read very often. Moreover, the decorations or any trace of usage of a single manuscript does not mean that all the copies were treated equally. See, Shopkow 1997, 218–219.

[30] Sweetenham 2005, 29–35. Gilo's narrative can be found in RHC Occ. vol. 5, pp. 691–800. I have decided not to make use of this text. This is for two reasons. Firstly, the aforementioned edition is not up to the modern standards, and since I have not been able to enquire the current edition by C. W. Grocock and J. E. Siberry (1997), there would be no point in comparing the outdated and confusing edition to Robert's text. Secondly, and more importantly, analysing all the possible sources of these three Benedictines is utterly out of the scope of the present study. Moreover, since the other of Robert's main sources is nevertheless lost, the comparison with Gilo's later text would not benefit my efforts very much. Hence, I have confined myself to Sweetenham's excellent comparison which accompanies his translation of Robert's text and other research on the subject.

[31] Sweetenham 2005, 35.

[32] Sweetenham 2005, 35–42.

final touch on his work.[33] Furthermore, he explicitly claims that he wrote the narrative directly on parchment without delineation on wax tablets, as was the common practice.[34] Nevertheless, we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that Guibert would have amended or even rewritten his earlier text due to his reading of an early version of Fulcher's chronicle. Yet, I have noticed no traces of this in the text. In his last book, Guibert disputes some of Fulcher's claims and is obviously hostile towards him. Besides Fulcher's narrative, Guibert also used some letters from the crusaders.[35] In several passages, he refers more generally to the information that came from the participants, which may suggest that he also used oral sources.[36]

It is certain that all three Benedictines based their versions of the crusade substantially on the *Gesta*. This can be assessed by textual analysis: all narratives follow both the storyline and the verbal structure of the *Gesta* too closely for not being based on it.[37] This starting point requires us to take a closer look at what the anonymous text actually is and who the author might have been. Firstly, the text is written in relatively simple and blatantly unclassical style. The narration is in first person, and the author describes the military affairs in detail. Secondly, the author calls consistently and exclusively Bohemond of Taranto as his lord (*dominus*). Traditionally, this has been taken as a proof of his feudal subordination to Bohemond. Additionally, some features of the language seem to point to the South Norman descent of the author.[38] All this seems to corroborate the established interpretation, where the author is regarded as a

---

[33] "Praesentis historiae corpori, auctore mundi propitio, posituri calces, Fulcherium quemdam Carnotensem presbiterum…quaedam quae nos latuerant alia, diverse etiam a nobis aliqua sed pauca, haecque fallaciter et scabro, ut ceteri, sermone fudisse comperimus. Cuius etsi non omnia, nonnulla tamen delegenda et huic scedulae compaginanda censuimus." GN VII.xxxii.1640–1647.

[34] "Parcat quoque lector meus sermonis incuriae, indubie sciens quia quae habuerim scribendi, eadem michi fuerint momenta dictandi, nec ceris emendanda diligenter excepi, sed uti presto est fede delatrata membranis apposui." GN, praefatio 118–122. For the process of creating medieval texts, see Clanchy 1993, 114–144; and Rider 2001, 29–49.

[35] See for example GN VI.xxiii.875, VII.xxxiii.1709, VII.xxxiv.1732.

[36] "...ea sane quae ferebantur in libro contuli crebrius cum ipsorum qui facta viderant verbo, et proculdubio expertus sum quia neutrum discreparet ab altero. Quae autem addiderim, aut ab his qui videre didicerim aut per me ipsum agnoverim." GN, praefatio 78–82. See also IV.xviii.874–879; VII.vi.298, VII.xi.489, and VII.xxvii.1393. It is possible though that all this information came from letters or through secondary accounts.

[37] This is undisputed among the scholars. See for example Packard 2001, 25; Rubenstein 2005, 188–189; Sweetenham 2005, 4, 14; France 1998a, 58; Huygens 1996, 9, 57–58; Riley-Smith 1986, 136–137; Hill 1962, ix; Hagenmeyer 1890, 76–80. It is also supported by my own reading of the sources. The recent editor of Guibert's chronicle is of the opinion that Guibert had used a version which is closest to the text of ms. C in Hagenmeyer's edition. As I do not know which versions of the *Gesta* the other Benedictines had used, I have nevertheless, decided to hold to Hill's edition. This edition, moreover, gives the most important deviations between the main text and the version which Guibert had supposedly used (signified as ms. X in Hill's edition). See Huygens 1996, 58; Hill 1962, pp. xxxviii–xlii.

[38] Sweetenham 2005, 12–13; Hill 1962, pp. xi–xvi; Bréhier 1924, pp. xix–xxi; Hagenmeyer 1890, 1–10, 33–39; for a thorough analysis of the syntax and the use of language in *Gesta Francorum*, see Gavigan 1943, 10–102.

Norman knight from southern Italy. On second thoughts, however, this interpretation arouses some serious doubts.

In fact, several notions seem to support an alternative interpretation: that the Anonymous was not a knight but a cleric instead.[39] First of all, the simple language of the text should not be taken as an indication of laic authorship because not even all the clerics at the time could write elegantly in Latin.[40] For example, Raymond's narrative is not substantially more polished than the anonymous version. Moreover, the fact that the narrative is written in the first place would suggest for ecclesiastical authorship. For it was quite rare for an early-twelfth-century layman to be able to read, let alone to write a narrative history.

Another feature, which has been taken as an evidence of laic status, is that the author quotes the Bible slightly incorrectly. This might mean that he did not use the written text but recited quotations from memory. Yet, from this notion does not follow that the author was "a devout layman", as Rosalind Hill has proposed.[41] Instead, this would suggest that the author had an ecclesiastical education according to which he aimed to write.[42] It is possible though, as suggested by Louis Bréhier, that the *Gesta* was co-authored by a cleric who amended certain parts of the narrative and added biblical quotations.[43] Although not widely accepted, this is a possibility that should not completely be disregarded.

Furthermore, the fact that an author narrates most of the battles as if he was in the middle of them does not necessarily mean that he would not have been a cleric. The narrative point of view does not necessitate actual participation in the events, for it can simply be a stylistic convention.[44] Furthermore, even if the author did engage in the action, it would not indicate a laic status. The notion that the ecclesiastical reformers endeavoured to promote an ideal of pacifist clergy should not deceive us to think that these ideals were true in everyday life. In all the narratives of the crusade, the papal legate Adhémar of Le Puy is frequently depicted as leading his troops in the middle of

[39] The following arguments are my own but they are mostly based on Rubenstein 2005, 179–204; see also Flori 2009, 717–746.
[40] Clanchy 1993, 246–252; Auerbach 1965, 237–338, esp. 276. Note that although the words *clericus* and *litteratus* were sometimes used as synonyms, it does not follow that the person in question was necessarily a cleric or literate in the modern meaning of the word. Both words may have referred to a person with *some* knowledge of letters. For this see Clanchy 1993, 226–230. He stresses that both terms were relative to context, and especially to the user. Learned monks would thus not have used these words very lightly, if they held high standards for literacy.
[41] Hill 1962, 54 n. 9.
[42] Rubenstein 2005, 187; Hill & Hill 1974, 10; cf. Hill 1962, pp. xiv–xv.
[43] Bréhier 1924, pp.v–viii; cf. Hill 1962, pp. xv–xvi. Though, if this was the case, it should appear peculiar that the clerical collaborator did not revise the incorrect biblical quotations.
[44] Rubenstein 2005, 187–188 and n. 47.

action.[45] Moreover, even Pope Leo IX and his famous successor Gregory VII had personally led armies against their adversaries.[46] Why then could an anonymous crusader not be both warrior and cleric at the same time? It is thus by no means evident that the Anonymous was a knight. Instead, it seems probable that he was a cleric, as recently suggested by Jay Rubenstein.[47]

The identity of the anonymous author may be a difficult problem to solve, yet the question of textual relationship between the early crusader narratives is even trickier. According to the traditional view, the *Gesta* was accomplished very soon after the crusade, and that the other texts use it, more or less, either as the basis of their narratives or as an aide-mémoire.[48] The earliest manuscript of the *Gesta* is dated to the early twelfth century. It is, of course, not the original, but an early copy nevertheless.[49] The nineteenth-century scholarship saw the *Gesta* as an abridged version of a text that has been attributed to Peter Tudebode.[50] In the footsteps of Heinrich Hagenmeyer, however, the later scholars established that the *Gesta* was, in fact, not an abbreviation, but that Tudebode's version was an extended and slightly modified version of the *Gesta* instead.[51] The problem of this prevailing view is that the narrative of the *Gesta* has some severe incoherencies here and there. It is possible that some of those result from scribal lapses. Yet, not all of them are so easily explained.[52] In addition, the fact that no

[45] Rubenstein 2005, 188. For Adhermar's role on the Crusade, see France 1994, 288–294. On the status of legate in general, see Menache 1990, 51–56.
[46] Kaeuper 2009, 12–13; on the prohibition of violence and its observance, see Brundage 2003, 148–149.
[47] Rubenstein 2005, 188. Into this discussion, I would like to add that it is quite easy to provide textual "evidence" with different interpretations. For an example which supports the argument of a laic status, see GF xxix (68), "Episcopi nostri et presbyteri et clerici ac monachi, sacris uestibus induti, nobiscum exierunt cum crucibus, orantes et deprecantes Dominum, ut nos saluo faceret et custodiret et ab omnibus malis eriperet. Alii stabant super murum portae, tenentes sacras cruces in manibus suis, signando et benedicendo nos. Ita nos ordinati et signo crucis protecti, exiuimus per portam quae est ante machomariam." The passage suggests that the author was not with the preaching ecclesiastics, but instead in the ranks of those whom the priests sought to bless. An analogous contrast to this would be the passage in GF xxxvi (86), where the author writes, "Nostri denique milites precedentes nos liberauerunt ante nos uiam illam…" Here the author clearly proclaims that, at this point, he was not with the "knights". Hagenmeyer 1890, 441 n.15, reads this passage to imply that the author had lost his horse and from this on travelled by foot. Moreover, some have taken this to suggest that the author had even lost his knightly status (See Hill 1962, 86 n. 5). Another, and quite simple, explanation would be that the author simply was not a *miles* in the first place. Similarily, many passages can be seen as an evidence to either direction. In my opinion this supports the view according to which the *Gesta* is a compilation of some kind. For this, see below.
[48] France 1998a, 41–43, 58; Hill 1962, pp. ix–x.
[49] Hill 1962, p. xxxviii. It is somewhat exceptional to have a medieval text which is even close to the original.
[50] Tudebode, Peter. *Historia de Hierosolimitano itinere*. RHC Occ. vol. 3, 1–117. [Henceforth "PT"]; translated with the same name by J. H. Hill and L. L. Hill (1974). Peter Tudebode was an eyewitness, but it is recently questioned by Rubenstein who he really was. See Rubenstein 2005, 179–204. Tudebode's version differs from the *Gesta* in that it uses third person, adds some new information, omits some, and disagrees with it in few passages. The narrative structure and the storyline, however, are quite the same.
[51] Hagenmeyer 1890, 39–92; Hill 1962, ix–xi; France 1998a, 39–69.
[52] For this discussion, see Flori 2007, 717–746; Rubenstein 2005, 179–204; Hill & Hill 1974, 1–12; cf.

official records of the crusade have been preserved is regarded peculiar by some.[53] On these grounds, and by comparing the *Gesta* with those which in the traditional view are thought to be drawing from it, some have concluded that there must have been an earlier text or a group of texts behind all the extant narratives.[54]

Furthermore, it has been suggested that the *Gesta* might have served as propaganda for Bohemond's recruiting trip to France in 1105–1106, which was made in order to promote a military expedition against the Byzantine Empire.[55] This hypothesis is partly based on textual comparison between the *Gesta* and the account of Peter Tudebode, which are textually very close to each other.[56] It is supported by the way how the Anonymous glorifies Bohemond and vilifies Emperor Alexios; as well as the narrative structure, which by focusing on Antioch understates the fact that Bohemond actually left the crusade after the capture of Antioch.[57] It is possible that the Benedictine narratives stemmed from these circumstances, which supposedly gave a wide dissemination for the *Gesta* in France. This hypothesis is supported by the notion that the chronicle of Albert of Aachen seems not to have been affected by the anonymous narrative, possibly because he wrote beyond its sphere of influence.[58] The favourable portrayal of Bohemond and the disparagement of Alexios, which are present with all the Benedictines (though least with Baldric), are certainly related to this context.[59]

France 1998a, 39–69; France 1998b, 29–42,

[53] The recent translators of Tudebode's version wrote that "it is incredible that an expedition of the magnitude of the crusade would have been first recorded by a simple Norman knight, an unknown canon, an obscure priest, and a few letter writers without benefit of official scribes from the various households." See Hill & Hill 1974, 12.

[54] Originally proposed by Hill & Hill 1974, 5–12; and more recently advanced by Rubenstein 2005, 197–198, and Flori 2007, 717–746; cf. France 1998a, 39–69, and 1998b, 29–42.

[55] Sweetenham 2005, 5–6; Rubenstein 2005, 184 n. 26; Phillips 2007, 29–30. This thesis was originally presented by August C. Krey. Bohemond and his father Robert d'Hauteville (known as "Guiscard") had conteded with Emperor Alexios since 1081. Initially Bohemond struck the Byzantines a number of times, but the defeat of 1083 and his father's death in 1085 brought a truce in the contest. Having thereafter claimed Antioch, Bohemond fell into an ambush in August 1100, was captived by the Muslims, and held in prison until 1103. After this, the hostilities between the Normans and the Byzantium continued. Bohemond set off for his recruiting tour in France in Semptember 1105. During this trip, he was married to Constance, the daughter of King Philip I of France. In the autumn of 1107, Bohemond launched an attack against the Byzantium. The offensive was not a success and Bohemond submitted to a peace with Alexios, according to which he had to swear an oath of fealty to the Emperor. Bohemond's motivations for crusading might thus not have been entirely spiritual.

[56] Flori 2007, 717–746.

[57] Wolf 1991, 207–216; cf. Hill 1962, p. x n. 3, who doubts this theory. Moreover, Emily Albu asserts that these portrayals are not as homogeneous as often thought. Instead, she claims, the Anonymous changed his views at the time of the battle of Antioch and especially after Bohemond's desertion. Her arguments, however, fail to convince me. Not least because it presupposes that the author would have written during the journey and had not edited the earlier text, which is seems not very plausible to me. Furthermore, she holds to a highly romantised view of the author as a literally capable but candid layman reflecting sincerely his observations and opinions. See Albu 2001, 145–179. For the criticism of this interpretation, see Rubenstein 2005, 179–204; Flori 2007, 717–746.

[58] Edgington 1998, 55–67.

[59] France 1994, 375, notes that the hatred of the Byzantines emerges in the sources only since the letter

However, it does not follow that the Benedictines would have written with an intention of supporting Bohemond's cause, as suggested by Carol Sweetenham.[60] In fact, all the Benedictines slightly downplay the role of Bohemond in favour of the other characters. Moreover, his departure from the crusade after the capture of Antioch is moderately reproached by all the Benedictines.[61] They also seem to balance the Antioch-centred narrative by stressing the importance of Jerusalem.[62] Finally, all the elements which can be seen as propaganda for Bohemond and against Byzantium are already in the *Gesta Francorum*. Nonetheless, I do not disagree with the view that the narratives in question might have been written with an aim of legitimising the crusade and promoting another expedition in support of Kingdom of Jerusalem. Indeed, this might have been within the intentions of at least some of the authors.

In summary, it is possible that there was a common source for Raymond, Tudebode, and the anonymous author. For some reason, however, the Benedictines chose to use the *Gesta* (or a version very much like it) as their main source. To me, this would simply suggest that there was no better source available for the authors. If there were, then why would the Benedictines not use those instead of an anonymous narrative, which they did not esteem very highly? The implication is that if there was a lost source it was already lost at the time when the Benedictines wrote – or, alternatively, that it was considered unsuitable as a source. Therefore, I would hesitate to pursue the hypothesis of a lost source too far.

To conclude, it is certain that the anonymous narrative called *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, which might have been created as propaganda for Bohemond, influenced greatly on the later crusade narratives. The reasons for this are uncertain – and it may remain thus forever. As argued by John France, this situation

---

from the crusader princes to Pope Urban in September 1098: in it, the Byzantines are described as heretics. One should further notice that the letter names Bohemond first of the all princes, clearly presents his voice, and gives him a prominent standing as the conqueror of the city. For the letter, see *Epistulae et chartae ad historiam belli sacri spectantes quae supersunt aequales ac genvinae* (ed. Hagenmeyer 1901), pp. 161–165. For some reason, Fulcher of Chartres inserted this letter into the first recension of his narrative but not in the later version. Therefore, a translation of the letter can be found in Fink 1973, 107–112.

[60] Sweetenham 2005, 5–7, 22, 191 n. 38.

[61] See RM VIII.viii (where Robert asserts that everybody knew that the *pura justitia* was on Raymond's side in their dispute over Antioch), and xv (where Robert comments Bohemond's desertion); GN III.ii (where Guibert is notably critical towards Bohemond and his father), VI.xix (where Bohemond is described as "acer et insolens" because of his dispute over Antioch), and xxi (where Bohemond departs ("…amicae sibi Antiochiae divisionis impatiens, a praefatorum contubernio disparatus, remeavit ad illam"). Baldric seems to be the least disapproving towards Bohemond, writing that both Raymond and Bohemond were right (*utrumque tamen verum erat*). Yet he points out that the decision troubled the people and hampered the common mission. See BB III.xxvii (87b–d), IV.i.

[62] See Chapter 2.2; and Sweetenham 2005, 16, 49–50 regarding Robert.

seems to have led some scholars into a deceptive pitfall of overvaluation.[63] For, while considering the *Gesta* as "the normal" narrative, they have forgotten that it should not be seen as a "reliable eyewitness account", but instead as a literary narrative about the deeds of certain crusaders and of God.[64] It should be obvious that from the given narrative, one cannot grasp but a single, biased, version of the expedition. However, when treated as representations and intentional acts of communication, the accounts of the First Crusade are truly valuable sources for research.

1.3 Methods, Perspectives and Research

It should be clear for any serious medievalist that in order to make factual assessments, we should first do a proper textual and contextual analysis of our sources. This is not enough, however, for it has for long been realised among the scholars that no text is "transparent" in the sense of being able to convey the pure facts.[65] Unlike the traditional methodology of historiography has taught us, it is not reasonable to take any representations of recalled experiences as facts, only because they are evaluated as plausible. Already in 1974, Roger Ray suggested that

> Besides treating the usual topics of manuscripts, authorship, dating, and the like, editors should now tell all that comes only by way of a thorough historical and philological explication of the text. They should speak, in other words, of such matters as genre, exordial thought and literary intention, anticipated audiences and their likely expectations, narrative forms and techniques (here the question of sources and their use should come up), and of all these against the backdrop of the medieval author's own notion of historical truth. Comments on factual reliability should come in the course of this kind of discussion, together with remarks to scholars less interested in what happened in history than in how people thought and wrote about it, which is an important part of what happened. Such essays would destroy lingering illusions of positivism, open historical texts to all medievalists, and be fundamentally more empirical than what has long passed for editorial science.[66]

Peculiarly enough, the narratives of the First Crusade have still not been put under this kind of scrutiny. Indeed, given the nature of the source material, it is rather dispiriting to observe how many historians of the crusades still aspire to squeeze pure facts out of the texts. Even in the cases when a thorough source criticism is done, it is mostly conducted in order to assess the factual reliability of the sources. This may be due to the fallacious

[63] France 1998b, 29, 36.
[64] See also Packard 2011, 33–34.
[65] See for example Deliyannis, Deborah & Mauskopf 2003, 2. For a thorough discussion on the subject, see Spiegel 1997, esp. pp. 3–56; and more concisely: Spiegel 1999, 1–12.
[66] Ray 1974, 58.

views on plausibility, or the innate positivism of historians that they are able to grasp the past, as Gabrielle Spiegel has suggested.[67] Either way around, the eyewitness accounts of the First Crusade were for long held reliable only because they were eyewitness accounts, and because they, unlike the later rewrites, were not apparently rhetorical in nature. Hence, it was thought that there was no reason to mistrust them. It should be obvious that this kind of thinking results in misjudgements. It not only rests on the untenable view that a representation could somehow be objective – that the meaning or fact could be separated from the mode of utterance – but also ignores the fundamental question lurking behind the sources: why were the texts written in the first place?

How then should we proceed in trying to interpret our sources? My approach is twofold.[68] First of all, in order to acquire valid information from sources, one has to analyse the textual or symbolic relationships, i.e. styles, tropes, forms, and both inter- and intratextual allusions within the text. This is the textual context of the source. Yet it is not enough. Without taking into consideration also the social function of the text, the contemporary meanings of it cannot be properly understood. Considering that texts are mostly used as communication between people, we can begin with the premise that the signs constitute symbolic messages, which are meant to be received and understood by someone. These messages are of course not received exactly as they were sent but instead as modified by the recipient's mind. Nevertheless, it must be supposed that texts manage to carry some information, for otherwise it would not be possible to communicate at all. It can therefore be assessed that texts are referring not only to other texts but also to the world behind them – that is, men and their beliefs of which we only have remnants and shadows now. At least in theory, this notion makes it possible for a historian to acquire information of the non-textual past, a world which has existed materially as well. This is what Gabrielle Spiegel has called "the social logic of the text".[69]

---

[67] Spiegel 1999, 10.

[68] I follow here the ideas that are mostly put forth in Spiegel 1997, 3–28, 44–56.

[69] Spiegel 1999, 7–8; Spiegel 1997, 3–28. As Spiegel is well aware, the problem of this approach is that in order to give the meaning to the primary sources, one has to rely on the other texts and their meaning. Consequently, we treat other texts (contemporary sources and scholarly literature alike) differently than some of our primary sources. Spiegel considers this "enormous epistemological cheat" as unsolvable. See Spiegel 1999, 8–10. Indeed, the problem seems to be insurmountable for all historians in the search for solid facts. Yet, if one considers the text, context, and implications as nothing more than traceable reconstructions based on the coherency of all the surviving remnants, I see no theoretical cheat in here. The practical problem however, is that as long as the scholars have to rely on epistemologically dated studies, they cannot reconstruct a coherent web of critical information from which to postulate. Thus, every postulation is at least partly based on flawed reasoning and false information, which duplicates when others use this study on their postulations. The problem can only be coped with critical reading of the former research – and with time. Yet it is solvable, if we do not trust our sources too much.

The question of medieval history writing has recently been under substantial scholarly discussion, resulting in numerous articles as well as some full-length books on the subject having been published.[70] A recent trend of study has been to examine the texts and books themselves, taking into account the questions of compiling and writing different kind of narratives and the practical issues involved in this – as well as the more strictly textual aspects of literary modes, styles, rhetoric, audience, purposes of writing and commissioning, as well as the contemporary function of history.[71] Yet the subject of crusade historiography has been almost totally disregarded among these scholars.[72] The historians of the crusades, on the other hand, have been interested mostly in the actual events, the ideology and the definition of crusading, as well as the perceptions of the crusaders.[73] Thus, the important question of writing and rewriting the history of the crusades has been much disregarded. Precious exceptions to this are Verena Epp's comprehensive study on Fulcher's chronicle and Barbara Packard's recently published doctoral thesis on the historiography of the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries in relation to crusading and its subsequent remembrance.[74] Worth of noting is also the recent article of Jay Rubenstein, in which he examines only one twelfth-century manuscript (BNF lat. 14378) that comprises the crusade narratives of Fulcher of Charters, Walter the Chancellor, and Raymond of Aguilers, covering the questions of provenance, use, and purpose of this book.[75]

Considering the sources in question within the present study, there has been relatively much interest in the eyewitness accounts and the relationship between them.[76] This is of great importance because the analysis of the first-hand sources is crucial to our understanding of the events and their immediate remembrance. Nonetheless, very little attention has been given to the later narratives, which were based on the first-hand accounts. Regarding the Benedictines, there has been some interest in Guibert and his works, but this has been mainly concerned with his later autobiography.[77] In addition,

---

[70] See for example the three-volume publication *The Medieval Chronicle*, which bases on the seminars on the medieval historiography.
[71] For example, Albu 2001; Rider 2001; Shopkow 1997; Spiegel 1997, 83–212; Reynolds 1996; and Blacker 1994.
[72] This deficiency is noted for example in Phillips, 2007, 19; and Rubenstein 2005, 180 n. 5. For more thorough discussion, see Packard 2011, 12–14.
[73] For a historiographical outlook, see Constable 2008, 3–43.
[74] Epp 1990; Packard 2011. The older discussion on the subject is grounded on the dated methodology, which entirely bypasses the text–past issues, and thus does not cover the important aspects of historical perceptions, intended audiences, and purposes. See for example Iorga 1928.
[75] Rubenstein 2004.
[76] See above the discussion on the eyewitness accounts.
[77] For example, Benton 1970; and more recently Rubenstein 2002. The latest translation of Guibert's *De vita sua* is done by Paul Archambault (1996). Laetitia Boehm has examined Guibert's

his historiographical perceptions and the use of language have interested the scholars.[78] Baldric, on the other hand, has only been analysed as a poet – which he certainly was.[79] Thus far, there is not even a translation of his *Historia*, although such is currently in the making.[80] On Robert, there are few older studies as well, but none that would thoroughly discuss his crusade chronicle through the modern methodology.[81] Undoubtedly the best study in this regard is Carol Sweetenham's introduction to her translation of Robert's narrative.[82]

Despite the fact that apparent similarities between the Benedictine narratives have for long been recognized, a major deficiency remains in that no one has ever perused all the three Benedictines together. Jonathan Riley-Smith has shortly examined the question of rewriting the history of the First Crusade in his book on the development of the idea of the crusading.[83] Also Carol Sweetenham touched the subject in the introduction to her translation of Robert's history. All the narratives in question have been treated in various general studies about crusading. Yet the major part of the attention given to these accounts has concerned with their description of the Council of Clermont, which was the event where the initial call for the crusade took place. The obvious reason for this interest is that Fulcher, Baldric, and Robert present us the only complete eyewitness accounts of this event. Guibert's version of it is deemed important as well, although he was most likely not present at the event.[84] All four accounts reproduce the important papal sermon given at the council. Over a century ago, these versions were treated by Dana Munro in her classic essay on the subject.[85] Unfortunately, she disregarded all the rhetorical aspects of the accounts as unimportant. By now, the rhetorical nature of the accounts has been acknowledged. Yet this notion

---

narrative in *Saeculum*, vol. 8, no. 1, 1957 ("Gesta Dei per Francos – oder 'Gesta Francorum?'"), but unfortunately I have not managed to make my acquintance with the article. Furthermore, her doctoral thesis on the subject remains unpublished.

[78] For example, Leclercq 2004; Levine 1989; Burstein 1978; Chaurand 1965.

[79] Baldric's poems are edited as *Les oevres poetiques de Baudri de Bourgueil (1046–1130)* by Phyllis Abrahams (1926).

[80] Steven Biddlecombe, the editor of forthcoming new edition of *Historia Jerosolimitana*, has informed me that Susan Edgington is currently preparing the translation.

[81] See for example Kraft 1905.

[82] Sweetenham 2005.

[83] Riley-Smith 1986, 135–55. See also Blake 2008 (1970).

[84] Both Baldric and Robert claim to have been present at the council. Robert enunciates this clearly in the apology preceding his book. See RM, apologeticus sermo (721). Baldric does not say it explicitly, but his usage of first person in two phrases has been taken as a proof of participation. These are BB I.v (15g–h): "Inter omnes autem in eodem concilio, *nobis* videntibus…", and BB I.vi (16d–e): "Solutum est concilium, et *nos* unusquisque properantes *redivimu*s ad propria." My emphases. Most scholars have been inclined to consider Fulcher as an eyewitness, although nowhere does he claim to have participated in it. To my knowledge, there is no external evidence of the participation. See Kangas 2007, 29; Huygens 1996, 13, 54; Cole 1991, 12, 19; Riley-Smith 1986, 15, 5; Fink 1973, 7–8; Munro 1906, 232–4.

[85] Munro 1906.

has only led the scholars to disregard the narratives as later refinement that cannot deliver us unbiased knowledge about the actual council. This is quite true if we are only to assess the facts. Yet, the question of historical refinement is important as such. In this regard, the later revisions are of paramount value.

More recently, all four accounts were discussed by Penny J. Cole as a part of the monastic preaching tradition.[86] Yet, Cole failed to notice that these are primarily literary works, which used rhetorical devices to enliven the narrative. Therefore, she did not take into account that the actual sermon and a literary representation of it could have both different form and different audiences. Accordingly, the narratives of the sermon should not be analysed as actual speeches, but as literary reproductions of the contingent sermon instead. This is what John O. Ward has done in his excellent article concerning the crusade historiography of the twelfth century.[87] Unfortunately, Ward focused only on few specific sections of the narratives in question.

In short, although the textual relationship between the Benedictine versions and the *Gesta Francorum* has been acknowledged for long, there still is no comprehensive study on the subject. In consequence, all three Benedictines are generally lumped together and considered as presenting a uniform picture of the crusade. The discongruencies between these narratives and their dissimilar interpretations of the crusading have been almost totally ignored.[88] In the present work, I attempt to contribute to this shortcoming. This is by no means supposed to be the final sentence on the subject. In order to provide a comprehensive treatment on the subject, one would have to make a re-examination of the manuscripts, for at the present there are no adequate editions of Baldric's and Robert's narratives.[89] This would also require profound acquaintance with all the early sources of the First Crusade and their relationship with the vernacular poetry – something which I do not yet have. In the present study, I read my sources side by side, comparing them line by line with each other, and discussing the topics relevant to the questions of how and why the narrative was altered.[90] Besides the Benedictine versions and the *Gesta*, I have also tried to take

[86] Cole 1991.
[87] Ward 1985.
[88] See for example Sweetenham 2005, 14; Riley-Smith 1986, 139, 152. Kangas 2007, 211, wrote that one of her basic assumptions was that the Benedictines would have considered "fighting and the spilling of blood" differently from the eyewitness accounts. Yet, she concludes that there is "no correlation between the writer's background and his description of violence". In my opinion, however, there are significant differencies both in the modes of description and the meanings given to the violence. See Chapters 2.2 and 4.3 in this study.
[89] These are in the making under a project of the University of Bristol. Unfortunately, the project has apparently run out of funding. See http://www.bristol.ac.uk/history/research/iherosolimitana.html.
[90] A method that was already recommended by Ray 1974, 55, but seems not to have been used very much.

into account the other three "eyewitness" narratives – namely Fulcher's, Raymond's and Tudebode's – although it is not in the scope of this study to present a thorough analysis of all these narratives. This approach stems from the fact that all of them made use of the *Gesta,* and therefore we can use them as comparison to the Benedictine narratives.

A sufficient analysis of a textual remnant has to embrace the issue of the purposes of committing the text. To put it differently, it is important to ask why and for whom the text was written? The question of purposes is not, however, the easiest one to answer. Only rarely the reasons of writing were made explicit – and even in those cases the information provided may not be reliable. Furthermore, it can be fairly questioned, whether it is at all possible to know the determining cause or intention behind human events, not to mention the problem of proving it. Humanistic disciplines are particularly dependent on the narrative forms of presenting the results of their research. The reliance, on the one hand, and the exercise of linguistic devices on the other, has been correctly pointed out by critical scholars, above all by Hayden White.[91] This notion has some unfortunate implications. Because the scholarly narratives are literary representations, they have to confine to the limitations and conditions following this very fact. Yet, at the same time, a scholar should not succumb to the exigencies of the narrative form, but instead research his or her subject with an open mind. This can be exceptionally difficult when one is pondering the question of purpose. The reason for this is due to a phenomenon, which in a recent and popular book by Nassim Nicholas Taleb has been called "narrative fallacy".[92] According to Taleb, narrative fallacy is a feature of the human mind, in which a sound explanation for a particular event is constructed retrospectively in order to create a sensible narrative out of the information. The problem is that this causality, as already argued by Immanuel Kant, is often invented, and therefore, although reasonable, it is not actual. Taleb claims that the narrative fallacy is something we cannot evade, for unconsciously and compulsively we reason and explain the past so that it would make sense to us.[93] Nevertheless, the question of purposes has to be explored, for without a rationale, it is impossible to understand the meanings of a text. And without meaning, there can be no

---

It is true that this method is burdensome. Therefore I hope that some day we can truly utilise the quantitative power of computers as an aid for qualitative analysis. Here, the problem is not the hardware itself but the lack of functional applications, i.e. the software.

[91] White 1973.

[92] Taleb 2008. See also Spiegel 1997, 20–21.

[93] Taleb 2008, esp. pp. 63–4, 105–6, 119–20. For Taleb's perception of history, see 194–200. His criticism of the explanatory power of historiography is well founded, but obviously he is not very familiar with the Weberian methodology, which seeks to understand the meanings and purposes of things in the past, instead of trying to explain the causalities of the past events.

communication, let alone a good story.

The approach, which I will employ in the quest for purposes, is to regard texts as communication.[94] All communication takes place within certain conventionally defined rules – whether linguistic, behavioural, or mental. In order to grasp the meaning of a communicative act, these contingent precepts have to be understood. An important aspect to consider here is the question of genre. That is to ask, within which literary traditions did the authors write? The question is grounded upon a premise that a genre is, at least to some degree, a definite factor for the conventions of writing. This presumption, however, can easily mislead us, for the early twelfth-century notions about genres were much more vague and unestablished than the modern perceptions. Not many medieval writers bothered to discuss the genres in depth, and those who did seem to have had fairly different ideas about them.[95] Nonetheless, the authors certainly had some preconceptions about what they were doing. These aspects will be discussed thoroughly in the next chapter.

Another method, which has been utilised by modern semioticians and literary critics, is to take a look at the text itself.[96] According to this view, an author carries out the writing with an idea of reader(s) in mind. This intended or imagined reader can be partly traced because at least an unconscious notion of a reader is required in order to communicate a message. It is not possible to write, for example, without choosing a language. Choosing a language, moreover, presupposes a reader who understands it. It should be noticed that the intended reader is not the same thing as an actual reader of the text in question. The question of actual reader cannot be answered without external evidence, but the intended reader is to be found in the text.

The intended reader might be explicated, but usually it is merely implicit. The *implied* reader can be grasped by inspecting the cultural, ethical, and literary expectations which are required for the reader to understand the text.[97] It is probable

---

[94] Here, one of my inspirations has been Sophie Menache's *The Vox Dei* (1990), which is an intriguing although sometimes oversimplifying study on the political communication in the Middle Ages.

[95] Ward 1999, 269–284; see also Dumville 2002, 1–27; Deborah & Mauskopf & Deliyannis 2003, 3–7; and Ray 1974, 33–61, who discusses the genres and the literary influences of medieval historical writing, as well as reviews much of the earlier scholarship on the subject.

[96] For the discussion, see Booth 2005, 75–88; Nelles 1993, 22–46; Wilson 1981, 848–863; and Suleiman & Crosman (ed.) 1980.

[97] Hans-Robert Jauss has called this *Erwartungshorizont*, "the horizon of expectations". He uses this concept to reveal how a text was understood in different times. This is a useful notion, for it utilises both intrisic and extrisic information to reconstruct the contingent contexts of reading and writing. Yet here, I am merely trying to define the nature or type of the audience by taking into account the expectations implied in the text. My usage of "intended reader/audience" should not be confused with "implied reader", though. The latter is a concept which Wayne Booth used to designate the ideal interpreter of the text. According to him, it is necessary for an actual reader to subordinate his mind to the book's set of

that the author might have been aware of the approximate conditions in which his work might be read. Thus, he could have directed his message to an audience which may not actually read it but which encounters it in excerpts, orally, or not at all. This must be taken into account, especially with ancient and medieval texts which were almost invariably meant to be read aloud.[98] Because of this, it is for our purposes more appropriate to speak of an audience than a reader.

There are some passages in Robert's text that should be examined here. For, Robert begins the apology of his work with a plea to all those who either read or *hear the text read to them*.[99] He also justifies his choice of plain style by claiming that an excessively elaborate discussion (*sermo*) can be hard to understand, and thus is in peril to fall on deaf ears (*aure surdiori hauritur*).[100] Such notions should not surprise us because the concern for audience was well founded in the medieval literary theory.[101] This concern was of great importance especially in the context of sermons. In them, the clerics had to work hard to win and to maintain the attention of their listeners.[102] In a preaching manual, which he had composed decades before turning his pen on the subject of crusading, Guibert commented this, saying that

> As St. Ambrose said, a tedious sermon arouses anger; and when the same things are repeated over and over, or when unrelated topics are dragged in during the sermon, it usually happens that the hearers lose everything from the sermon equally, because of their boredom, the beginning, the conclusion, and everything in between. Where a few ideas might have been presented effectively, a plethora of ideas presented at too great length leads to apathy and even, I fear, to hostility…So a preacher who abuses words interferes with what is already planted in the hearts of his hearers, what he should be helping to grow.[103]

---

values in order to understand the meaning of the text. I follow this line of though only up to the notion that the audience is, to some measure, implied in the text. See Suleiman & Crosman (ed.) 1980, 8, 35.

[98] For example, Clanchy 1993, 185–196, 206.

[99] "Universos qui hanc historiam legerint, sive legere audierint…" RM, apologeticus sermo (721). See also Robert's discussion in his prologue, where he differentiates between reading and hearing in the words: "qui haec legerint vel audierint", RM prologue (723).

[100] RM, apologeticus sermo (722).

[101] This was based on the classical rhetorical tradition. For classical literacy and its heritage in the Middle Ages, see Wagner (ed) 1986, 1–124; and Irvine & Thomson 2005, 15–41. On rhetoric, see Murphy 1974; Partner 1985, 59–165; and more concisely Murphy 2005, 1–26, and McKeon 1942, 1–32. On the way how the classical authors were used in education, see Reynolds 1996. The most important classical treatises were Cicero's *De inventione* and *Rhetorica ad Herennium* written by an anonymous author. The former was called *rhetorica vetus* and the latter *rhetorica nova* because it was believed that the latter was also written by Cicero. See Murphy 1974, 109; Murphy 2005, 3; Wagner (ed.) 1986, 16, 98–99, 105–107.

[102] The medieval theory of preaching (*ars praedicandi*) arose from these practical needs. See Roberts 2002, 41–62. For the practical issues, see Menache 1990, 22–26.

[103] "Apud beatum Ambrosium legitur quia sermo taediosus iram excitat; et cum eadem saepius replicantur, vel ultra modum diversa dicendo tenduntur, fieri inde solet ut taedio victis omnia pariter, prima, media et ultima auferantur, et quae prodesse pauca poterant, nimia et indiscrete effusa, in fastidium et pene quodammodo in odium vertantur…ita qui nimie verbam profert, et id quod auditorum cordibus insitum erat, et prolicere poterat, aufert." Guibert of Nogent, *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*, 4 (col.

It is thus important to acknowledge that the Benedictines were educated for taking their audiences into account. But what might this audience have been? Although that numerous conflicting assertions have been given, this question has gone with little analysis in the scholarship.[104] The fact that a text is written in Latin seems at first glance to imply an audience which understands Latin. On second thoughts, however, this is not the only possibility. First of all, the language of medieval texts does not indicate the language of their actual performance. Latin was by default the language of writing, but this does not mean that the text was necessarily read aloud in the same language.[105] We know that some Latin chronicles were partly dedicated or later presented to a lay patron who was unable to read Latin. What we do not know is whether these chronicles were orally translated for the patrons or were used merely as objects of prestige.[106] However, I hold it likely that their content was at least partly described for the patrons.

Furthermore, it has been argued that especially since the eleventh century, texts were not exclusively discussed within closed literate associations, but instead in wider communities which included illiterates as well as literates. Accordingly, texts represent only a part of the discourses of the so-called "textual communities".[107] Brian Stock presented this view regarding heretics and reformers, but it seems completely plausible to extend it to the crusading context as well. This can be justified with several arguments. First of all, the message of crusading was directed not only to ecclesiastics but especially to those who could wage war, i.e. the knights.[108] Secondly, crusading as a movement and as an idea, developed greatly in the course of the expedition, which means that the original papal message was transformed and further discussed within those who actually were on the expedition.[109] Finally, crusading was an affair concerning rather diverse groups of people. There probably was an endeavour to exclude the non-belligerent from the expedition, but this proved quite difficult to carry

---

24–25). Miller's translation.

[104] Packard 2011, 57, suggests that the authors of the first-crusade narratives may have aimed their work to a wider audience. Considering Robert and the Anonymous, Sini Kangas has taken almost as granted that they wrote for laic audiences. She also argues that Baldric wrote for a wider audience. Regading Guibert, she is not congruent – suggesting that Guibert wrote "also to be read aloud to a lay audience", and elsewhere that "Guibert is apparently inclined to produce a professional history for the circle of the highly learned ecclesiastics, including himself". See Kangas 2007, 31–32, 220; and Kangas 2008, 107–108. Jonathan Riley-Smith, on the other hand, has held it self-evident that the Benedictine chronicles were written for "monastic audiences", see Riley-Smith 1987, 148.

[105] Clanchy 1993, 206–11.

[106] Shopkow 1997, 223–224; Rubenstein 2004, 131–168.

[107] Stock 1983, 88–240, esp. 90–92. See also Shopkow 1997, 258–.

[108] Purkis 2008, 14; Riley-Smith 1986, 35.

[109] Riley-Smith 1986, 31–119.

out in practice. The reason for this was that the promoted message rested largely upon the tradition of pilgrimage, which was universal and overarching for all the faithful.[110] It is therefore quite certain that crusading was discussed in communities which included not only ecclesiastics but also laity with different grades of literacy/illiteracy. Consequently, it is possible that the crusade narratives were initially directed to wider than merely literate audiences. This is a question that can be examined with the aforementioned concept of intended audiences.

[110] See Riley-Smith 1986, 24; Porges 2008, 30–31; and Chapter 4.1 in this study.

2. Revision

2.1 The Crusade as History

> The more one thinks about it, the more overwhelming it becomes in the furthest recesses of the mind. For this was not the work of men: it was the work of God. And so it deserves to be publicised through a faithful account as much to those living now as for future generations, so that through it Christians' hope in God may be strengthened and more praise inspired in their minds.[111]

Each of the three Benedictines announced that they wrote in order to propagate the truth about the crusade for the faithful. At the same time, however, they all explicitly proclaimed to have written with an intention of correcting an earlier history, which they accused of being unpolished in style and expression. The question of how we should interpretate these statements about veracity, style and history is what will be considered next.

Robert writes in the apology preceding his chronicle that his patron was unsatisfied with the original narrative, partly, because it did not include the Council of Clermont, and in part, because it was poorly composed and "rough" in style.[112] Baldric claimed that, although "truthful", the anonymous narrative "defiled" its noble subject with its "rusticity". He asserted that its "rough and unpolished" language would immediately divert the "more sincere" readers from it.[113] Guibert wrote much the same, adding also that the story was probably adequate for the less learned who were interested merely in the "novelty of the story".[114] Nonetheless, those who thought that "honesty nourishes eloquence", would not, according to him, be content with the story because it was brief when the narration was supposed to be elaborate and dull when it should be eloquent. "As the poet says", Guibert continues quoting Horace, "they will

---

[111] "Quod quanto studiosius quisque advertet, tanto uberius intra mentis suae dilatatos recessus obstupescet. Hoc enim non fuit humanum opus, sed divinum. Et ideo litterali compaginatione commendari debet notitiae tam praesentium quam futurorum, ut per hoc et spes in Deum Christiana magis solidetur, et laus ejus in eorum mentibus vivacior incitetur." RM, prologus (723). Sweetenham's translation.

[112] "…quidam etenim abbas nomine Bernardus, litterarum scientia et morum probitate praeditus, ostendit mihi unam historiam secundum hanc materiam, sed ei admodum displicebat, partim quia initium suum, quod in Clari Montis concilio constitutum fuit, non habebat, partim quia series tam pulchrae materiei inculta jacebat, et litteralium compositio dictionum inculta vacillabat." RM, apologeticus sermo (721).

[113] "…nescio quis compilator, nomine suppresso, libellum super hac re nimis rusticanum ediderat; veritatem tamen texuerat, sed propter inurbanitatem codicis, nobilis materia viluerat; et simpliciores etiam inculta et incompta lectio confestim a se avocabat." BB, prologus (10).

[114] "Erat siquidem eadem Historia, sed verbis contexta plus equo simplicibus et quae multotiens grammaticae naturas excederet lectoremque vapidi insipiditate sermonis sepius exanimare valeret. Ea plane minus eruditis nec de locutionis qualitate curantibus ob illius novae relationis amorem satis oportuna videtur, nec aliter quam illi sentiunt ab auctore dici debuisse putatur..." GN, praefatio 10–16.

either sleep or laugh".[115] In order to understand why the Benedictines criticised the anonymous narrative, we have to reflect their historiographical notions against the contemporary literary tradition.

Medieval history writing rested upon two fundamentally separate traditions: the classical and the biblical. In neither of these was history an independent branch of study. In the classical tradition, history was defined by grammar and rhetoric, whereas in the biblical tradition it was a subdiscipline of theology.[116] In rhetoric, *historia* was basically a narrative which aimed to describe the past events.[117] Historiography, then, was considered as an art or craft (*ars*) of writing about the past.[118] The task of historian was to describe the events which he had seen or heard, so that the achievements and deeds worthy of remembering would not fall into oblivion.[119] This of course required that the narrative was related truthfully and with precision.[120] Accordingly, most authors assured that they were telling the truth. Raymond of Aguilers proclaimed that he (together with a knight, Pons of Balazun) had decided to write because the "misfits of war and cowardly deserters" had "since tried to spread lies rather than truth".[121] Robert declared at the end of his prologue that "everyone who may read or heard this should know that our story will contain nothing frivolous, misleading or trivial – nothing but the truth".[122] Fulcher of Chartres wrote quite similarly in his prologue (which was not present in the

[115] "...his autem,quibus pabulum eloquentiae estimatur honestas, dum ea minus apte dicta perpendunt ubi narrationis dinoscitur expedire comitas, et prolata succincte ubi facundiae paregorizantis decuit laciniosa varietas, dum susceptae materiei seriem nudo procedere vestigio vident, iuxta poetae sensum aut dormitant, aut rident…" GN, praefatio 16–22. [Levine]; Horace, *Ars poetica* 105: "...aut dormitabo aut ridebo".

[116] Noted for example in Deborah & Mauskopf & Deliyannis 2003, 1, 3; and Knape 2000, 11–12, 16. For the latter, de Lubac 1998, 45–47; Ainsworth 2003, 388–389. On rhetoric and the classical heritage, see note 101 above. Cf, Classen 1982, 387, who claims that the classical authors "prove to be little more than stylistic models". I have to disagree here because, although true that the Christian tradition was the primary example for medieval historiography, still the influence of classical authors was much more than stylistic. Coleman 1992, 276, has put this aptly: "What *we* refer to as the history written by medieval 'historians' was for them largely an exercise in oratory just as Cicero and other Roman models taught them it was, but now set within the overarching, exemplary theme of God's design for man's salvation, the *meaning* of which had no historical dimension other than that of the ever present." Original emphasis.

[117] As established in the rhetorical theory: "Historia est gesta res, sed ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota." *Rhetorica ad Herennium* I.viii.13; "Historia est gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota…" Cicero, *De inventione* I.xix.27; "Historia est narratio rei gestae per quam ea quae in praeterito facta sunt, dinoscuntur…Historiae sunt res verae quae factae sunt", Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, quoted in Ainsworth 2003, 388.

[118] See Knape 2000, 11–27; Blacker 1994, pp. xii–xv; Partner 1985, 5–59 for the differences between modern and medieval perceptions of history.

[119] Knape 2000, 18–19; Ainsworth 2003, 388.

[120] This was a common place in the classical discourse of historiography. Likewise, it was stressed, for instance, by the influential seventh-century scholar Isidore of Seville, who was one of the few to comment the theory of historiography in the Middle Ages. For Isidore, see Ainsworth 2003, 387–388.

[121] "…maxime ideo quia imbelles et pacidi, recedentes a nobis, falsitatem pro veritate astruere nituntur." RA, p. 235.

[122] "Et sciant qui haec legerint vel audierint quia nihil frivoli, nihil mendacii, nihil nugarum, nisi quod verum est enarrabimus." RM, prologus (723)

first redaction of his chronicle), referring to his status as an eyewitness: "I have recounted in a style homely but truthful what I deemed worthy of remembrance as far as I was able or just as I saw things with my own eyes on the journey itself."[123] Baldric wrote that he sought to be free of either positive or negative feelings, so that he could bring forward the truth of his sources.[124]

Guibert was driven on the defensive by the nature of his testimony: that he, who had not seen the affairs by himself but instead listened and read the stories of others, aimed to rewrite the eyewitness accounts. Guibert's decision was to argue that in a way hearing was almost as good as seeing. Using the words of Horace, he writes, "What has been thrust into the ears stirs the mind more slowly than those things which have appeared before reliable eyes".[125] In other words, he argued that sometimes things could be seen more clearly from a longer perspective.[126] Some modern historians might find this argument easy to agree with.

As we see, factual accuracy was by no means insignificant for medieval writers.[127] Yet these assurances for veracity cannot be taken as an indication of empiricism, as some have done.[128] Neither can we suppose that the medieval authors

---

[123] "…stilo rusticano, tamen veraci, dignum ducens memoriae commendandum, prout valui et oculis meis in ipso itinere perspexi, diligenter digessi." FC, prologus 2 (116). Ryan's translation from Fink 1973.

[124] "…tamen in proferenda historiae veritate, in neutram amor vel odium, vel cetera vitia, me scientem praecipitabunt partem…Proferendae siquidem veritati temperanter studebo; et animi mei favorem, quem tamen Christianis debeo, veritatis censura castigabo." BB, prologus (10)

[125] "*segnius* irritent *animos demissa per aurem / quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus*", GN IV.9–10. Levine's translation; Horace, *Ars poetica* 180–181.

[126] The fact that one is an eyewitness for a given event and another is not would to modern mind – and in classical historical methodology – indicate the priority of the former. However, this presupposition ignores three crucial aspects. Firstly, the non-eyewitnessing account can be better informed than the eyewitness. Secondly, it can also be more profound in its narration, thus being more useful for those who are not familiar with the topic. Finally, and most importantly, the eyewitness is not necessarily any more sincere in its report than the non-eyewitness. Thus one should not consider it true until falsified, for this assesment rests on questionable premises.

[127] The topic of eyewitnessing and factuality is also discussed in Packard 2011, 30–36; and Harari 2004, 77–99. Although otherwise fine article, Harari is of an opinion that the eyewitness account is somehow a different genre than history. Unlike the literary history, he argues, the eyewitnessing account would aim to be factually true and would therefore not include fictional invention – it would be like a subjective raport. It is true that the contemporaries made a distinction beween a narrative history and a non-narrative chronicle/annals/calendar. Furthermore, eyewitnessing was originally the basis of historian's information. Yet this theory, even if embraced by the author, was not followed in practice: a historian was often not an eyewitness, and the distinction between non-narrative and narrative accounts were constantly blurred. Thus I cannot agree with Harari on his views of the difference between eyewitnessing account and history. Yet, I do concur with his conclusion that instead of investigating "the facts" of the Crusade, we should rather investigate the notion of factuality in the time of the Crusade (As already suggested by Ray 1974, 58).

[128] It still is a resilient commonplace in the medieval scholarship that Guibert would have been an analytical and almost modern historian because he invariably mentions his sources and is critical towards some authors. It was indeed unusual for a medieval author to indicate sources other than the Bible or the classical authors. But this anomaly does not make Guibert a modern historian. For example, Cole 1993, 98, wrote on Guibert that "He was a painstaking historian who, like all historians, sought to be credible and convincing. He is careful, for instance, to inform his reader that he drew his information about the

would have shared our notions of factuality. Accordingly, it has been suggested that the medieval authors thought the past not as facts but more in terms of *digna memoria* – things that were worthy of remembering.[129] It is noticed that some medieval writers asserted that historian's task was not to explain the past but merely to relate it.[130] Yet, the prevalent opinion was that historian was not only supposed to recount the "facts", but also to weave them into a proper narrative (*historia*/*narratio*).[131] Indeed, the fundamental factor which distinguished history from the other historical genres was that it presupposed literary treatment of its subject.[132] History was supposed to be a good and entertaining story – not just a factual report.[133] This, however, presupposes that the narrative comprises material that is not exactly "factual", but instead something that makes the story more vivid. This material – which Cicero described as something "similar to truth" – could be applied especially to descriptions of battles and speeches (actual or not).[134] This was also a necessity, for who could have recounted the actual words as they were uttered, let alone provide objective descriptions of some chaotic battles?[135]

In accordance to this, the Benedictines imply in few places that their representation of the given oration is based on the imagination (which nevertheless

---

Christian heresies from an ecclesiastical history – although he does not tell us which one – catalogues of heresies, and writing 'against the heretics, although again, he provides no more precise bibliographical information." For criticism of this kind of view, see Ray 1974, 43–, 46–47; Chaurand 1965, 381–395.

[129] Ray 1974, 41, 47.

[130] Knape 2000, 19.

[131] Ward 1985, 103–121, 148; Coleman 1992, 277–285; cf. Blacker 1994, xiii.

[132] The most important of these were the annals and the chronicle, which were originally one and the same thing, but in the Middle Ages they were sometimes perceived as two different genres. Similarly, the fundamental difference between these and the narrative history was not always clear to the medieval authors. In general, it seems that the medieval authors did not think much in terms of genres. This, however, does not mean that there was no distinction between different ways of writing history nor that a modern scholar should not use genres as an aid for analysis. It only suggests that the medieval authors did not hold to strict classifications of historiography. In the modern use of language, it is a common although disputed practice to use "history" and "chronicle" as synonyms. Yet, because the former is often used for referring the past in various senses and is thus quite amibiguous with all the modern connotations, it is sometimes preferable to use the word "chronicle" rather than "history". For the differencies between these genres see Dumville 2002, 1–27. For the discussion about medieval perceptions of genres and the use of these in modern scholarship see also Ward 1999, 269–284; Deborah & Mauskopf & Deliyannis 2003, 3–7; and Ray 1974, 33–61.

[133] Packard 2011, 29.

[134] "Inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium quae causam probabilem reddant." Cicero, *De inventione* 1.9; reiterated verbatim in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* I.ii.3. Like Cicero, all the latin rhetoricians speak of *inventio*, with which they meant the finding of material for arguments. As we see, it comprised both the factual things (*res verae*) and the fictional material (*veri similis*), which made the argument plausible (*quae causam probabilem reddant*).

[135] Acknowledged also in our sources, see GF xix (44), "Omnia quae egimus antequam urbs esset capta nequeo enarrare, quia nemo est in his partibus siue clericus sicue laicus qui omnino possit scribere uel narrare, sicut res gesta est. Tamen aliquantulum dicam." This notion is reiterated somewhat similarly in GN V.i but left out from Baldric's and Robert's versions.

aimed for the "truth").[136] Moreover, most speeches in the Benedictine narratives have exact parallels in the *Gesta Francorum* which therefore has clearly set the incentive for the Benedictine versions. The style and content of these has almost invariably been altered, though.[137] Especially in Baldric's narrative, the mere mention about discussion in the *Gesta* is habitually expounded into full-scale speeches.[138] The fictive element was, of course, not merely a feature of the rewrites, for also major part of the original narrative is full of imaginary material. With this, I do not refer to visions or supernatural interventions (for those were considered real), but particularly the lengthy discussion between Kerbogha and his mother, his letter to Muslims, as well as the lamentation of Suleiman at the end of the story.[139] Whether these descriptions of Saracen oration were based on some camp gossip or on pure imagination is irrelevant.[140] The point is that the author deliberately chose to make substantial use of these fictive tales in his historical narrative. This is a good example of how most medieval texts are tricky for reconstructing the actual events but at the same time constitute an excellent source for analysing perceptions on various subjects. Yet, one might wonder that if the only thing restricting the application of imagination for being used in historical description was the author's supposed intention for telling the truth, then where resides the "historical fact" of these narratives? Can one truly find that part of the history on which we can build our postulations about *wie es eigentlichen gewesen ist*?

The medieval historian thought not like an antiquarian (or the modern historian) who is curious about the past as it actually was. Instead, he, like his classical predecessor, thought that it was his duty and liberty to provide moral examples to imitate and to avoid. A narrative history was thus not a supposedly objective record of events but instead an edificative story about the past; in other words, it presupposed the ethical standards according to which things ought to be.[141] As a consequence, any representation of the past was customarily prone to moral and political agendas rather

---

[136] See for example, GN II.iii.119–120, "His ergo etsi non verbis, tamen intentionibus usus est"; RM VII.xvi (834d), "Haec et his similia venerandus pontifex dicebat…"; BB II.xix (53d), "His vel hujuscemodi dictis adquievit…"; and BB III.i (60b–c), "Haec igitur et hujuscemodi verba…profudit."

[137] For one of countless examples, see Bohemond's speech in GF xvii (35) and compare it to BB II.i (34a–f); RM IV.x (780); GN IV.xiii.525–539.

[138] For example BB I.x (19d–f) in comparison to GF ii (4); BB III.xx (80) in comparison to GF xxx (72–73); and BB I.xviii (23–24) in comparison to GF iiii (7–8). The last one is similarly but with different content expounded also in RM II.xvi (747–748).

[139] GF xxi (52–53), xxii (53–56), xxxix (96); Hodgson 2001, 163–176; Packard 2011, 75–76; and Harari 2004, 77–99.

[140] See Hill 1962, xv–xvi; Hodgson 2001, 163.

[141] Packard 2011, 9–10, 28–29; Ray 1974, 47. See for example John of Salisbury's definition, "Historia est narratio rei gestae ad instructionem posteritatis." (*Historia pontificalis*) quoted in Ainsworth 2003, 388.

than antiquarian curiosity. Histories were written with an intention of promoting certain ideas and ideals; and especially, they were committed in order to legitimise established institutions, like the ecclesiastical organisation, monastic communities, and regal power. The function of history was therefore first and foremost utilitarian.[142]

As suggested above by Fulcher, the issue of veracity was deeply intertwined with the style of narration.[143] In the rhetorical theory, it was deemed both misleading and rude to use an improper style. The problem of literary embellishment, however, was that one had to know how to use it. To some extent, the appropriate style depended upon the subject matter: formidable action required elaborate words, and likewise, it was fitting for disgraceful deeds to be described accordingly.[144] In keeping with this classical rule, Guibert wrote that "the style of writers should fit the status of the events: martial deeds should be told with harsh words" and, correspondingly, "what pertains to divine matters must be brought along at more controlled pace".[145] This, indeed, was the most outspoken argument of the Benedictines against the anonymous narrative: that this account was written in a style unworthy of the magnificent event itself. The Benedictines considered the crusade as being one of the most miraculous events of all ages – second only to the creation of the world and the mystery of the redemption.[146] In their eyes, the style of diction of the original was not apposite for the events, possibly because the author was too uneducated to weave the requisite colours into the narrative.[147]

The presumption that a plain style indicates more reliable narrative than an ornate one was present already in the antiquity.[148] In part, this was due to the ancient mistrust towards rhetoric as a discipline, manifested already by Socrates (as Plato's character) in his critique of the Sophists for using language for deception rather than

---

[142] See Spiegel 1997, 83–98; and the studies of Shopkow 1997 and Blacker 1994. Also Packard 2011, 10; and Albu 2001, 4–5.
[143] For classicism and style in the twelfth century literature, see Martin 1982, 537–568.
[144] "…elocutio est idoneorum verborum ad inventionem accomodatio…", Cicero, *De inventione* I,vii.9; for the proper use of style, see *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.viii–xiii.11–18. One should bear in mind that Cicero's famous quotation "historia magistra vitae" (though unknown in the Middle Ages) was actually given in the context of arguing for the importance of eloquence and oratory, "Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia nisi oratoris immortalitati commendatur?" Cicero, *De oratore* II.ix.36. The argument was that, despite of its importance, history was quite worthless unless woven into appropriate words.
[145] "...pro statu plane casuum sermo coaptari debet orantium, ut verborum acrimonia bellica facta ferantur, quae ad divina pertinent gradu temperatiore ducantur." GN, praefatio 24–26.
[146] See for example RM, prologus (723): "Sed post creationem mundi quid mirabilius factum est praeter salutiferae crucis mysterium, quam quod modernis temporibus actum est in hoc itinere nostrorum Iherosolimitanorum?"
[147] This is the main conclusion of the excellent article by John O. Ward. See Ward 1985, 148.
[148] On the mistrust towards eloquence, modern and ancient alike, see Partner 1985, 5–59.

argumentation.[149] Moreover, in the Christian tradition, it was held for long that whenever God delivered a message through an orator, the appropriate words would be divinely provided.[150] The importance of rhetoric for persuasion, as well as for understanding the Scripture, was strongly argued by Augustine of Hippo, one of the lasts to receive classical education.[151] Yet, the tendency to ignore oratorical skills prevailed fairly strong until the ninth century.[152] Then, at the turn of the millennium, the interest towards rhetoric began to increase, which led to novel applications concerning the fields of preaching (*ars praedicandi*) and letter writing (*ars dictaminis*).[153] Despite of this though, the suspicion towards ornate language did not vanish, for it was actually integrated within the rhetorical theory itself. According to the classical division, there were fundamentally three categories of diction, each of which required distinctive styles. For the didactic purposes, one used the most simple (*tenuis*) style of speech; for deliberative argumentation, it was apposite to use the middle (*mediocris*) style; whereas the most ornate (*gravis*) language aimed to stir the feelings of the audience.[154] This division implied that whenever the narration was ornate, it tended also to be more persuasive in emotional level – and the more lofty the language the more deceitful the purpose.

The demand for an apposite style could easily conflict with the concurrent requirement of veracity. This is why it was necessary to emphasise the sincerity of one's intentions as well as to stress the oratorical modesty of the narrative. This is precisely what the Benedictines did. Baldric expressed his regret for his "faint talent", wherefore he set about writing on the magnificent topic with a style which was "not polished enough".[155] Nevertheless, he did not want the "history worthy of relating" to fall into

---

[149] Plato calls oratory nothing more than flattery "…which…pretends to be that into which she has crept, and cares nothing for what is the best, but dangles what is most pleasant for the moment as a bait for folly, and deceives it into thinking that she is one of the highest value. Thus cookery assumes the form of medicine, and pretends to know what foods are best for the body…Flattery, however, is what I call it, and I say that this sort of thing is a disgrace…because it aims at the pleasant and ignores the best." Plato, *Gorgias* 464c–465a, translation by W. R. M. Lamb. See also the discussion in Partner 1985, 5–.

[150] This was based on Matthaeus 28:18–20; Marcus 3:14–15. On the Christian perceptions and the development, see Murphy 1974, 269–.

[151] Murphy 1974, 58–61.

[152] Murphy 1974, 82–88.

[153] On these two applications, which were established only later in the twelfth-century and especially during the thirteenth, see Murphy 1974, 194–355; and on *ars praedicandi*, also Roberts 2002, 41–62.

[154] On this distinction and the appropriate use the styles, see for example *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.viii.11–xiii.18. It is not certain that the medieval authors would have embraced this dipartite division, and certainly they regarded the lowly *sermo humilis* as the most preferable for most situations. But as the education was based on the classical authors, most of the literate were familiar with it. On this, see Ray 1974, 48–52; cf. Auerbach 1965, 25–66.

[155] "Hujus historiae seriem posterae succesioni stilo nostro, licet non satis expolito, nisus sum commendare, quamvis tantum onus ingenioli nostri tenuitas non suffecerit convenienter explicare." BB, prologus (9).

oblivion. Moreover, Baldric pleaded that if anyone aimed to correct the diction of his narrative, he would not do so because of envy or arrogance.[156] He himself had undertook the task of rewriting, not because he was "swollen with arrogance" or "in the search of vain glory", but as "diligent for committing to membrane whatever would please the future Christianity".[157] Correspondingly, Robert besought forgiveness for any element of "clumsy composition" in his narrative, for he claimed that he had written the text because of his obligation.[158] Furthermore, he explained his choice of a "pedestrian style" by asserting that, in his opinion, it was "more appropriate to clarify obscure things by simplifying than to cloud over the obvious by philosophising".[159] As, Marcus Bull has observed, this does not mean that Robert could not have written more sophisticatedly had he so wished.[160] In line with the classical tradition, both monks assured their sincerity, neutrality, and modesty. The claim was consolidated with an apology for using the simple style – i.e. for not being extravagant and therefore less credible. One should note that this was a common topos (*deminutio*) which was supposed to contribute to one's *auctoritas*.[161]

Even Guibert, who certainly wrote in anything but simple style, made similar assurances.[162] "In trying to compose the present small work", he writes in the prologue, "I have placed my faith not in my literary knowledge, of which I have very little, but rather in the spiritual authority of the history events themselves."[163] Guibert reproached Fulcher for producing "swollen, foot-and-a-half-long words" and for pouring forth the "blaring colours of vapid rhetorical schemes". In contrast, he claims to have tried to "snatch the bare limbs of the deeds themselves, with whatever sack-cloth of eloquence"

---

[156] "…hoc opus aggressus sum; et ne invidae oblivioni cederet historia digna relatu ad scribendum pene sexagenariam appuli manum. Sane si melius facundiores id ipsum attentaverint, ipsorum nequaquam praejudico, si me castigaverint, facundiae: tantum precor ut nostro non derogent labori, causa invidentiae vel culpa insolentiae." BB, prologus (10).

[157] "Accessi igitur hoc ad studium, non inanis gloriae cupidus, non supercilii tumore inflatus; sed quod successivae placeat Christianitati, membranulis indidi curiosus." BB, prologus (10).

[158] "…deprecor ut, quum in ea aliquid inurbane compositum invenerint, concedant veniam, quia hanc scribere compulsus sum per obedientam…" RM, apologeticus sermo (721).

[159] "Unde si qui academicis studiis innutrito displicet haec nostra editio, ob hoc forsitan quia pedestri sermone incedentes plus justo in ea rusticaverimus, notificare ei volumus quia apud nos probabilius est abscondita rusticando elucidare quam aperta philosophando obnubilare." RM, apologeticus sermo (721–722). Sweetenham's translation.

[160] Bull 1996, 43.

[161] *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.xxxviii.50; Sweetenham 2005, 59–60. For building one's credibility (or *ethos* as Artistotle called it) see Cicero, *Topica* xix.73–xx.78.

[162] On Guibert's use of language and style, see Burstein 1978, 247–263; Huygens 1996, 7–17; Levine 1989, 261–273; and Leclercq 2004, 101–115.

[163] "Ad presentis opusculi executionem multum michi prebuit ausum non scientiae litteralis, cuius apud me constat forma pertenuis, ulla securitas, sed historiae spiritualis auctoritas..." GN, praefatio 1–3. Levine's translation.

he had, "rather than covering them with learned weavings".[164] Thus, Guibert used exactly the same modesty topos as Robert: that simplicity contributes to reliability. One should note that none of the writers was plain in their style. All three Benedictines used various rhetorical devices and customarily employed the grandiose style in acclamations. Moreover, In another place, Guibert claims that "if anyone accuses me of writing obscurely, let him fear inflicting on himself the stigma of weak intellect, since I know for certain that no one trained in letters can raise a question about whatever I may have said in the following book."[165] Thus, Guibert clearly regarded himself as the most educated man of his age. Yet, this argument of his superior literary competence is in clear conflict with his earlier assurances of modesty. This demonstrates just how void certain customary assurances could be.

In the twelfth century, historian was almost invariably an ecclesiastic, and, as such, he was also a theologian of some measure.[166] Hence, it is the "spiritual authority" of the events that Guibert relies when he tries to dodge the issue of reliability. In other words, the argument is that albeit not witnessing the events by himself, he would still know better because he was initiated to the other means of knowledge. The argument is grounded on Christian tradition, according to which the history was profoundly based on the Bible and its exegesis. According to Hugh of Saint Victor, there could be multiple parallel yet hierarchical aspects of the same truth – like there were three dimensions of one God. Ultimately, of course, the truth was one. But as God's word was written into various and in many ways contradictory narratives of the Bible, one could not read everything literally.[167] Guibert evidently embraced this interpretation, as in his preaching manual he wrote that

> There are four ways of interpreting Scripture; on them, as though on so many scrolls, each sacred page is rolled. The first is history, which speaks of actual events as they occurred; the second is allegory, in which one thing stands for something else; the third is tropology, or moral instruction, which treats of the ordering and arranging of one's life; and the last is ascetics, or spiritual enlightenment, through which we who are about to treat of lofty and heavenly

[164] "Cum enim vir isdem *ampullas et sesquipedalia verba* proiciat et luridos inanium scematum colores exporrigat, nuda michi rerum gestarum exinde libuit membra corripere meique qualiscumque eloquii sacco potius quam pretexta contegere." GN VII.xxxii.1647–1651; Horace, *Ars poetica* 97. Levine's translation.

[165] "Porro si quis aliquid subobscure dictum causetur, notam sibi hebitudinis infligere vereatur, cum pro certo noverim quod ex his, quae in subiecto libro dixerim, nemini in litteris exercitato iuste questionem moverim." GN, praefatio 68–72. Levine's translation.

[166] Packard 2011, 36–37; Knape 2000, 19–20.

[167] For the origins and the development of exegesis, see de Lubac 1998. On the use of the Bible more generally, see Smalley 1952; and more recently Reeves 1991, 12–63.

topics are led to a higher way of life.[168]

Thus the truth had multiple aspects: historical, allegorical, moral, and mystical – all of which were simultaneously true, yet in different senses. As the Old Testament was read through the Gospel, so could the past, present, and the future be seen on the sacred pages. According to some, the divine signs prefiguring the multi-layered truth could also be seen everywhere in the nature.[169] Combined with the unilinear perception of time, this spiritual interpretation of word and the world permitted Christian authors to perceive the universe temporally and semiotically as one. This notion of providential truth was fundamental for monastic understanding of history.[170]

The historical or literal sense (which is the one we usually take as the only truth) was thus merely one aspect of the veracity. Furthermore, it was the least important one. Reading of the other senses required more erudite and experienced mind. This is the intellectual background for Guibert's claim of being able to understand the truth about the crusade better than his eyewitnessing sources. He assured that God certainly had implanted in him the truth and would guide him to choose the right words for narrating it.[171] This confidence would of course confirm his preceding argument for reliability: if God could not supervise the truth, then who could? The same argument is also employed for confirming the reliability of the sources, for if the sources were false so would his own words.[172] Furthermore, this condition applied only to the historical sense – in the moral and spiritual levels, the veracity of his narrative could be determined only by the Bible. This is precisely why all the writers sought to support their interpretation with allusions to the Scripture.

These allusions were not made only by extracting allegories and morals from the Bible and reflecting particular topics and events against these models, as was customary

---

[168] "Quatuor sunt regulae Spcripturarum, quibus quasi quibusdam rotis volvitur omnis sacra pagina: hoc est historia, quae res gestas loquitur; allegoria, in qua ex alio aliud intelligitur; tropologia, id est moralia locutio, in qua de moribus componendis ordinandisque tractatur; anagoge, spiritualis scilicet intellectus, per quem de summis et coelestibus tractaturi ad superiora ducimur." Guibert of Nogent, *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*, 4 (col. 25–26). Miller's translation. See also de Lubac 1998, 99. On the different senses of Scripture and the relationship of this exegesis on medieval preaching, see also the concise essay of Caplan 1929, 283–290.

[169] de Lubac 1998, 24–26, 78.

[170] Ward 2000, 72–73; Classen 1982, 403–414.

[171] "...quam enim certum semper tenui solo dei numine et per quos voluit consummatam, eam non dubium habui per quos etiam rudes ipse voluerit conscribendam. Qui enim eos per tot difficultates traduxit itinerum, qui succidit ante ipsos tot excrementa bellorum, dubitare non valui quod rei gestae michi quibus sibi placeret modis inderet veritatem nec negaret competentium ordini ornamenta dictorum." GN, praefatio 4–10. See also the quotation below.

[172] "Haec hactenus, deo favente digesta a viris omnimoda preditis sinceritate comperimus, qui si uspiam aliorum secuti opiniones, falsi sumus, studio fallendi nequaquam id fecimus…Gratias itidem deo qui sua facta suo spiritu, nostro ore composuit." GN VII.l.2161–2164, 2173–2174.

for the ecclesiastics. In addition, Guibert and Robert read the crusade as the fulfilment of certain prophecies which were found in the Bible.[173] This interpretation is implied already in the *Gesta*, where the Anonymous begins his narrative with the following words: "When that time had already come, of which the Lord Jesus warns his faithful people every day…"[174] The providential reading is also suggested in the dialogue between Kerbogha and his mother.[175] Here, the mother advises her son to renounce his intentions for fighting against Christians because these were supported by divine powers. Furthermore, she claims that it has been predicted already "in our book and in the pagan volumes" that Christians are destined to conquer them "wherever they will be".[176] This prophecy had also been reaffirmed by her astrological calculations. Yet she claims that she did not know "whether these things will come to pass now or in the future".[177] The fulfilment of prophecies is thus already implied in the *Gesta*. Guibert and Robert, however, substantially developed this providential interpretation. Aside from elaborating this particular episode, they expressed their literal reading very explicitly.[178] For example, Robert concluded his narrative with the assertion that God had informed about the success of the crusade through Prophet Isaiah and various other biblical authors.[179] Guibert wrote that also the resistance which they encountered was foretold in the Bible:

> If I may take the part for the whole, in accordance with the frequent exegetical practice, Jerusalem becomes "a heavy weight for all the people" because it recently imposed upon all people who are called Christian the weight of a very great labour for her liberation…But after Jerusalem has been raised, *all the kingdoms of the earth will gather against her*, which should not be taken allegorically, but, as the story that has just been told – as something that is displayed to heavenly eyes.[180]

In short, Guibert and Robert believed that the word had become literally true. Against

---

[173] In addition to the examples provided in this study, see Packard 2011, 36–37; Riley-Smith 1986, 142.
[174] "Cum iam appropinquasset ille terminus quem dominus Iesus cotidie suis demonstrat fidelibus…" GF i (1). Hill's translation.
[175] GF xxii (53–56).
[176] "…inuentum est in nostra pagina et in gentilium uoluminibus, quoniam gens Christiana super nos foret uentura, et nos ubique uictura, ac super paganos regnatura; et nostra gens illis ubique erit subdita." GF xxii (55).
[177] "Sed ignoro, utrum modo, an in futuro sint haec euentura." GF xxii (55). Hill's translation.
[178] See RM VI.xii; and GN V.xi–xii.
[179] RM IX.xxiv.
[180] "Si partem pro toto, secundum frequentem Scripturae usum, licet poni, 'lapis *oneris cunctis populis*' Iherusalem fit, quia universis christiani nominis gentibus maximi laboris pondus in sui liberatione nuper indixit…Sed levata Iherusalem '*omnia regna terrae adversus eam colliguntur*', quod non ut allegoria subintelligendum, sed ut historia noviter relata supernis oculis intuendum proponitur." GN VII.xxi.928–932, 942–945; Zacharias 12:3.

this, it is quite interesting that there is no suggestion of providential interpretation in Baldric's narrative. Although he employs biblical quotations in support of his moral interpretation and the divine nature of the crusade, nowhere does he claim that the expedition was foretold in the Scripture. As a matter of fact, he even omits those parts of the dialogue between Kerbogha and his mother which discuss the aforementioned prophecies.[181]

Before further advancing with the interpretations, however, it might be of interest to provide a brief overview of the stylistic and structural changes which the Benedictines conducted in the story. One of the most salient aspects of these rewrites is their numerous allusions to the classical literature. As a matter of fact, there is none in the *Gesta Francorum*, and against this, the reworking is quite tremendous. Guibert was undoubtedly the most industrious of the monks in this respect. Besides direct quotations, he habitually composed verses of his own in various classical metres.[182] According to Armelle Leclercq, Guibert used the verse in order to argue and heighten the ideological matter in his narrative.[183] For the most part of his text, however, Guibert chose to write in prose. This combination of prose and verse, called prosimetry, was not completely unordinary in medieval chronicles.[184] Still, it seems to reflect the vacillation between history and epic – to which one of these classical genres should a history of the crusade belong? In his prologue, Guibert explains that although asked otherwise he decided to write in prose, for the crusade "deserved being told with greater dignity than all the histories of Jewish warfare".[185] In his opinion, the prose had more gravity than the verse, while the verse was more appropriate for descriptions of formidable deeds.[186]

There are many classical allusions in Baldric's text as well, yet only one of these is set apart in verse.[187] One of the most distinctive features of his style is that, although being entirely prose, it is still very poetic in style. This effect is partly due to the

---

[181] Compare BB III.iv with GF xxii (53–56).
[182] Guibert refers at least to Caesar, Herodotus, Sallust, Juvenal, Terence, Horace, Lucan, Virgil, Sidonius, Suetonius, Pompeius Trogus, Solinus, and Isidore of Seville. See RHC Occ. vol. 4, p. xviii and the notes in Levine's translation.
[183] Leclercq 2004, 101–115.
[184] Sweetenham 2005, 65; Leclercq 2004, 102; Epp 1990, 358–360.
[185] "Quidam sane prosa ut scriberem, metro autem id fieri plerique rogabant, quoniam talis me studii in primevo rudimenta celebrasse satius iusto compererant. At ego, iuventute, gradu experientiaque provectior, non id verbis plausilibus, non versuum crepitibus enuntiandum rebar, sed maiori, si dicere audeam, quam omnes belli Iudaici Historias maturitate dinum digeri, si esset cui deus copiam super hac re tribueret, arbitrabar." GN, praefatio 48–56. Levine's translation.
[186] "…decet enim licetque prorsus operosa Historiam verborum elegantia coornari, sacri autem eloquii mysteria non garrulitate poetica sed aecclesiastica simplicitate tractari." GN, epistola 29–34.
[187] See the verse from *Aeneid* in BB IV.xv (104). According to the edition of RHC, there are several allusions to Virgil, Lucan, and Sallust. See the editorial notes. At the very beginning of his first book, Baldric refers also to Titus Flavius Josephus, a Jewish author of *De bello Judaico*. See BB I.i (11b–c).

extensive usage of rhymes but also because of his delicate elocution. Quite a typical example of this can be found in the beginning of his letter to Abbot Peter which precedes his narrative:

> Amor mihi silentium interdicit, et in verbositatem inducit: amor aufert otium, et trahit in negotium: amor vetat ut sileam; cogit ut loquar et scribam. Totum hoc agit amor: non novus, sed inveteratus et continuus, quodam tamen modo renovatus.[188]
>
> (Love prohibits the silence and leads me into verbiage; love overcomes the leisure and draws into labour. Love forbids me to be silent; it impels to speak and write. All this is driven by love – not novel, but ancient and lasting, yet somehow renewed.)

One should notice especially the application of assonance, an effect which arises mostly from the specific use of cases and tenses: accusatives (*-um*, *-em*) are combined with verb endings *-am*, the adjectives ending in *-us* are also set together, while repetation of the pivotal noun (*amor*) and the predicates in present tense maintain the rhythm of the narration. As result, Baldric's text is periodic and consequently fairly easy to follow.[189] This illustrates the fact that the text was meant to be read aloud, and thus it was extremely important to write it so that it was pleasure to the ear.

Regarding the classical allusions, Robert is much more frugal than the other two monks are.[190] Despite of his apologies, Robert style is nevertheless anything but crude. It is not very classical, yet it is fairly rich in figurative language and strong in narration.[191] Like Guibert, also Robert wrote in prosimetry.[192] Yet for the verse passages, he drew mostly on the tradition of vernacular *chansons de geste* rather than the classical models.[193] To this and the implications, we will return in the last chapter of this study.

All the Benedictines made minor changes on the narrative structure of *Gesta Francorum*. These alterations were done partly in order to improve the narrative flow, but they are also made in order to correct the original interpretations. Therefore, we will analyse these alterations more thoroughly in the other chapters of this study. In general,

---

[188] BB, epistola (5).
[189] Rhymes were not used in the classical poetry, which was based on metre. Yet the means for it were acknowledged. See *similiter cadens* and *repetitio* in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.xiii–xiv.18–21, xx.28. For the importance of rhytmics in medieval *grammatica*, see Murphy 1974, 157–161; on Baldric's style, see also RHC Occ. vol. 4, p.viii.
[190] Thus far only few classical allusions in Robert's narrative have been noticed: one to Horace, one to Ovid, several to Lucan. See Sweetenham 2005, 63 and the notes.
[191] See Sweetenham 2005, 64–68.
[192] For this, see Sweetenham 2005, 65–66.
[193] Sweetenham 2005, 61–63. For further discussion, see Chapter 4.3.

however, the Benedictines followed the given arrangement rather closely. The most apparent exception to this is that all three included minute descriptions of the papal sermon in the Council of Clermont. Besides this, Baldric inserted numerous speeches which were usually mentioned but not described in the *Gesta*. Like the other two Benedictines, also Baldric consistently presents more detailed descriptions of the battles than the Anonymous. Robert made use of his other main source (the unknown verse chronicle) especially at the places where he turned from prosaic relation to verse laudation, i.e. mostly the descriptions of battles. Consequently, Robert's narrative is at some parts dissimilar with the other three both in style and in content.[194] In Guibert's narrative, the first book and the latter part of the last book are composed of material that cannot be found in the other narratives. This material consists mostly of arguments and of various minor stories considering the topic. These are also incorporated in other parts of the narrative, mostly at the beginnings and the endings of his books. In the last book, Guibert dedicates also several pages to discussion of Fulcher's narrative, which he knew in an early redaction. In addition to this, there is some new information in all three rewrites. It is likely that some of this was based on oral sources.

2.2 Meaning and Legitimacy

In the previous chapter, we examined the authors' perceptions of history and the contexts of historiographical writing in general. We also took a glance at the features which the Benedictines altered in the original narrative. This analysis was done in general terms, with a particular attention to style and structure – i.e. the form of the story. Yet, form can be separated from content only in abstraction; if we take a look at the narratives themselves, it comes out clear that these two are inextricable parts of the same story. From now on, I will treat these aspects together, so that the main focus turns on the content. Next, we will discuss the questions of how the Benedictines saw the crusade in general. That is to ask, what were its aims and meaning? How was the violent expedition explained and justified?

According to the Anonymous, the crusade was divinely ordained "pilgrimage" to Jerusalem. It was conducted by the Franks (*Franci*) who were both warriors (*milites*) and pilgrims (*pauperes Christi*, *peregrini*). During the expedition, God protected his army against "infidels", showing his support by providing spoils, bestowing divine visions, signals, and even by sending an army of martyrs in a critical moment to overcome the enemy. All these interpretations were accepted by the Benedictines,

[194] See Sweetenham 2005, 17–18 for additions and 18–19 for omissions.

although some were further developed, as we will see in the subsequent chapters.[195] Nevertheless, these features *were* in the original narrative. Aside from the divine ordination, the only justification for the expedition in the anonymous narrative is that the territories in question belonged to "God and the Christians".[196] For the crusaders themselves, this might have been too self-evident to concern about. Yet, for some reason the Benedictines (who wrote few of years later) obviously had an urge for justification. They all made significant efforts to reconstruct an image of a legitimate expedition – efforts which included explaining both the intention for and the execution of the crusade.

In the anonymous narrative, Jerusalem is the axiomatic goal for the crusaders, but the author did not bother to explain this further. Hence, the question remains: in what sense was Jerusalem the goal of the crusade? Was the significance of the city symbolic or literal in nature? The role of Jerusalem in the original crusade message has been a subject of intense scholarly debate.[197] In the Benedictine narratives, its importance was argued and emphasized in various ways. Baldric even began his chronicle by this very word:

> Jerusalem, capital of all Judaea, noble and famous city, resplendent with many royal honours; so often oppressed by tyrannical enemies, razed to the ground, deprived of her own children and hold in captivity, crushed by the tribulations of the time before the advent of the Saviour; [Jerusalem] they know, who read the writings of the historians, however occasionally, as well as those who have bent avid ears to the tales of annals.[198]

This sentence employs seven clauses of which all define the first word, Jerusalem, thus assigning it various meanings until the tension is finally released by the predicate in the middle of the sentence. This creates a tension for the most important first word. The possible pitfall of this technique, however, is the resulting disintegrity and obscurity. Yet, Baldric overcomes the danger with his good sense of pauses and similar cases

---

[195] See Chapters 4.1 and 4.2.

[196] "Rogant uos igitur omnes pariter nostri maiores, ut uelociter recedatis a terra Dei et Christianorum, quam Petrus apostolus iam dudum predicando ad Christi culturam conuertit." GF xxviii (66).

[197] Cowdrey 2008 (1970), 3–16; and Riley-Smith 1986, 21–22 argue for the initial centrality of Jerusalem. Compare to Erdmann 1977 (1935), 355–371; and Mayer 1988 (1965) 9–13 who suggest that the original object was to bring aid to the eastern Christians and that Jerusalem became the central goal only during the crusade. See also Housley 2001 (1987), 27–40 for the later development of the idea.

[198] "Jerusalem, totius Judaea metropolim, non ignobilem nec ignotam civitatem, regalibus honorificentiis in immensum multotiens decoratam, multotiens a tyrannis hostibus obsessam, et ad solum usque dirutam, et a propriis filiis in captivitatem abductis orbatam, variasque temporum tumultationes ante Salvatoris adventum perpessam, noverunt vel qui historiographorum libros saltem tenuiter legerunt, vel qui computantium relationi aures audiendi avidas accommodaverunt." BB I.i (11a–b). Translation modified from Ward 1985, 139.

(*homoioptoton*). Moreover, there is only one subject (*qui*) in the sentence, and it subordinates all three predicates. In this way, the apparent risk of *obscuritas* is turned into an excellent piece of *hyperbaton*, which forms a powerful opening for a book about reclaiming Jerusalem.[199] In his version of the papal sermon at Clermont, Robert made similar efforts for promoting the importance of Jerusalem:

> Jerusalem is the navel of the Earth. It is a land more fruitful than any other, almost another Earthly Paradise. The redeemer of human race illuminated it with his arrival, adorned it with his words, consecrated it through his passion, redeemed it by his death, and glorified it with his burial. Yet this royal city, at the centre of the world, is now held captive by her enemies and enslaved by the people who are ignorant of the ways of the people of God. So she begs and craves to be free, and prays endlessly for you to come to her aid.[200]

Here the historical significance and the religious salience of Jerusalem are combined with an emotional personification of the city. The point is further stressed at the very end of his chronicle where Robert gives an equivocal description about the history of Jerusalem, which clearly underlines its importance.[201] It is apparent then, that both authors saw Jerusalem important not only because it represented the Christian Church and prefigured the Heavenly Jerusalem, but also because it was the most important place on the Earth.[202] In this context, it is interesting that Guibert, in his version of the papal sermon, presents his argument in a form that is profoundly logical:

> If what was said by the Lord remains true, namely that *salvation is from the Jews*, and it remains true that the Lord of the Sabbath has left his seed for us, lest we become like those of Sodom and Gomorrah, and that Christ is our seed, in whom lies salvation and blessing for all people, then the land and the city in which he lived and suffered is called holy by the testimony of the Scripture.[203]

According to the Aristotelian logic, the argument is not exactly a perfect syllogism. In order to be such, it would have to include the premise "in the Bible it is claimed that the

---

[199] This analysis, although my own, is in debt to the discussion in Ward 1985, 139.
[200] "Iherusalem umbilicus est terrarum, terra prae ceteris fructifera, quasi alter Paradisus deliciarum. Hanc redemptor humani generis suo illustravit adventu, decoravit conversatione, sacravit passione, morte redemit, sepultura insignivit. Haec igitur civitas regalis, in orbis medio posita, nunc a suis hostibus captiva tenetur, et ab ignorantibus Deum ritui gentium ancillatur. Quaerit igitur et optat liberari, et ut ei subveniatis non cessat imprecari." RM I.ii (729a–b).
[201] RM IX.xxv–xxvi.
[202] Housley 2001, 28–29.
[203] "Si enim verum constat quod a Domino dicitur, quia videlicet *salus ex Iudaeis est*, et dominum sabaoth semen nobis reliquisse constat ne sicut Sodoma simus et Gomorrae similes fiamus, et semen nostrum Christus est, in quo salus et omnium gentium benedictio est, ipsa terra et civitas, in qua habitavit et passus est, Scripturarum testimonio sancta vocatur." GN II.iv.127–133.

city of Jerusalem is holy". Instead, it is an enthymeme – a logically imperfect yet rhetorically valid argument that is based on presuming those premises which the audience takes at face value.[204] The argument is nevertheless supposed to be logical, for it rests on the logical connection between the premises and the conclusion – indeed, it even questions (even if ostensibly) the veracity of the Scripture in order to conclude the holiness of Jerusalem. This enthymeme is supported with further reasoning in the spirit of the classical topos of comparison:

> If this land [was] the inheritance of God, and his holy temple, even before the Lord walked and suffered there, as the sacred and prophetic pages tell us, then what additional sanctity and reverence did it gain when the God of majesty took flesh upon himself, was fed, grew up, and moving in his bodily strength wandered and acted there?[205]

After leaving the subject for a brief excitatory, which will be further discussed below, Guibert advances with a bold hypothesis, arguing that had Christ not died in Jerusalem, nor been buried there, or lived there at all – still, even in this case, would Jerusalem be holy because it was the source of Christian belief: "*for the law* came *forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.*"[206]

To sum up, all three Benedictines were in pains to stress the city of Jerusalem as the central goal of the crusade. This emphasis was implied already in the *Gesta Francorum* (as well as the other eyewitness accounts), which would suggest that the liberation of Jerusalem was indeed an original goal of the crusade, instead of being a later distortion by the revisionists. According to Jonathan Riley-Smith, the attitude of eleventh-century Christians towards Jerusalem was "obsessive".[207] Yet, the significant urge which the Benedictines apparently felt for proving the sanctity of Jerusalem would imply that not everyone thought the *city* as the legitimate goal of an armed expedition. Like many other things, Jerusalem had different levels of meaning in the contemporary thought. In his preaching manual, Guibert expressed a standard definition of Jerusalem with all its meanings:

---

[204] For logical reasoning and enthymemes in rhetoric, see Cicero, *Topica* xii.53–.

[205] "Si enim et terra dei hereditas et templum sanctum antequam ibi obambularet ac pateretur dominus in sacris et propheticis paginis legitur, quid sanctitatis, quid reverentiae obtinuisse tunc creditur, cum deus maiestatis ibidem incorporatur, nutritur, adolescit, corporali vegetatione hac illacque perambulat aut gestatur…". GN II.iv.133–139. Cf. Cicero, *Topica* xviii.68–70.

[206] "Ponamus modo in Iherusalem Christum neque mortuum nec sepultum nec ibidem aliquando vixisse. Certe, si haec deessent omnia, solum illud ad subveniendum terrae et civitati vos excitare debuerat quia *de Syon* exierit *lex et verbum Domini de Iherusalem.*" GN II.iv.168–172; Isaia 2:3.

[207] Riley-Smith 1986, 21.

> …historically, it represents a specific city; in allegory it represents the holy Church; tropologically, or morally it is the soul of every faithful man who longs for the vision of eternal peace; and anagogically it refers to the life of the heavenly citizens, who already see the God of Gods, revealed in all His glory in Sion.[208]

It is thus possible, as Norman Housley suggests, that the papal curia would actually have meant the patriarchate of Jerusalem rather than the city as the goal of the crusade.[209] This, however, is not the case with the Benedictines. Riley-Smith denotes that already the crusaders had believed that they were heading not only towards the material city (or the patriarchate), but also to the Heavenly Jerusalem.[210] This is manifested by a letter, dated to September 1098, in which the crusading princes ask Pope Urban to come to Jerusalem and to open the gates of "both Jerusalems".[211] Moreover, in the *Gesta Francorum*, Bohemond tells his constable to be vigorous in his efforts for God and the Holy Sepulchre because the war was "not carnal, but spiritual" in nature.[212] Also Robert and Guibert wrote constantly about the "twofold" nature of the journey.[213] Baldric, moreover, wrote that

> …the Jerusalem which you see, to which you have come, and in whose presence you stand, prefigures and represents the heavenly city. You can see that visible enemies oppose us here. Invisible enemies, moreover, hem in the roads coming to her, against whom a spiritual conflict remains. And it is more important for us to struggle *against the spirits of wickedness in the high places* than *against flesh and blood* which we see…it is certainly to be feared that the heavenly city will be closed to us, and taken away from us, if our house is seized by malignant strangers as a result of our slothfulness.[214]

Thus, the material city was intertwined with the heavenly one: losing Jerusalem to the

---

[208] "…secundum historiam, civitas est quaedam; secundum allegoriam, sanctam Ecclesiam significans; secundum tropologiam. id est moralitatem, anima fidelis cujuslibet qui ad visionem pacis aeternae anhelat; secundum anagogem, coelestium civium vitam, qui Deum deorum facie revelata in Sion vident, signat." Guibert of Nogent, *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*, 4 (col. 26). Miller's translation.
[209] Housley argues that the "literal theology" of Jerusalem gave way to the more useful symbolic interpretation as the georaphical frontiers of the holy war diversified. See Housley 2001, 27–40.
[210] Riley-Smith 1986, 119.
[211] "Petri es uicarius, in cathedra eius sedas et nos filios tuos in omnibus recte agendis oboedientes habeas…portas etiam utriusque Hierusalem nobis aperias…" *Epistulae et chartae.*.. p. 164:4.
[212] "…hoc bellum carnale non est sed spirituale." GF xvii (37).
[213] "bifaria operatio", RM I.ii (730a); "gemina transmigratio", GN I.i.96–97; "cruces Christum geminas ferendo" GN IV.vi.327.
[214] "… ista Jerusalem, quam videtis, cui advenistis, cui adestis, illam civitatem coelestem et praefigurat et praetendit; hanc nobis invisibiles obsident inimici, adversus quos spiritualis constat conflictus. Et gravius est nobis obluctari *contra spiritualia nequitiae in coelestibus*, quam *adversus carnem et sanguinem* quos videamus…Pro certo timendum est ut civitas illa coelestis nobis claudatur, nobis auferatur, si nobis desidiosis a malignis hospitibus nostra domus abdicabitur." BB IV.xiii (101a–d); ad Ephesios 6:12. Transl. modified from Housley 2001, 29; and Riley-Smith 1986, 147.

sinners barred also the doors to the heavenly city; but on the other hand, it was even more dreadful to forget the inner battle against the invisible enemies. This kind of merging of the different meanings of Jerusalem was not common. Yet it might have been necessary in order to justify the spiritual rewards which were merited from participating in the crusade. In any case, neither in the eyes of the crusaders nor in the later revisions was the expedition merely a battle against Muslims. For, at the same time, it was also an inner, spiritual contest. Hence, it required true conversion and could be seen as a journey towards the Heavenly Jerusalem.[215]

Therefore, all three monks followed the Anonymous in placing the city of Jerusalem as the main goal of the crusade. But apparently, they felt need to justify it. One part of the justification was the merging of the different meanings suggested above. This was not enough, though. For, why in the first place was it necessary to occupy the city? As an answer, the Benedictines gave somewhat dissimilar interpretations of the nature of this operation. They all saw the crusade as a counter-offensive – a response to the aggression by Muslims. Baldric wrote that ”the temple of God has been polluted”[216] and continued by specifying that the circumstances of practicing Christian faith in Jerusalem had been made unbearable: the holy places were taken for secular activities, churches turned into stables, and pilgrims subjected to outrageous swindle, repression, and physical violation.[217] According to Robert, the pope claimed that the Saracens have

> …either overthrown the churches of God or turned them over to the rituals of their own religion. They throw down the altars after soiling them with their own filth, circumcise Christians, and spill the resulting blood either on the altars or pour it into the baptismal vessels.[218]

Guibert used very similar imagery but, strikingly, he also disclosed the source of it: a letter that claims to be written by Byzantine Emperor Alexios to Robert of Flanders.[219] In it, the atrocities against the Christians are described rather graphically. The letter seems to have been also Robert’s source of information, for the narrative sequence and the content are quite alike. The most obvious similarities are the assertion on

[215] Riley-Smith 1986, 147, argues that the Benedictines regarded this unacceptable. I have to disagree on this because they clearly deemed that the crusaders were converted (even if temporarily) to the new kind of knighthood which was spiritually meritable. On this, see Chapter 4.1.
[216] “Pollutum est nimirum sanctum Dei templum…” BB I.ii (11e).
[217] BB I.ii (11–12).
[218] “…ecclesiasque Dei aut funditus everterit aut suorum ritui sacrorum mancipaverit. Altaria suis foeditatibus inquinata subvertunt, Christianos cicumcidunt [sic], cruoremque cricumcisionis aut super altaria fundunt aut in vasis baptisterii immergunt.” RM I.i (727e–f).
[219] GN I.v.435. The letter is edited by Hagenmeyer in *Epistulae et chartae*…, pp. 129–136. Translation can be found as appendix in Sweetenham 2005, 219–222.

circumcision and the subsequent contamination of baptismal vessels. Robert also states rhetorically that about the "abominable violation of women" it is worse to discuss in length than to pass over in silence.[220] In the letter and Guibert's version of it, this theme is expatiated thoroughly and expanded into comprising also "sodomy", which here meant raping men.[221] Moreover, merely the fact that the letter is associated with virtually all of the surviving manuscripts of Robert's chronicle is enough to suggest a close link with the chronicle and the letter.[222]

The relationship between the letter and Baldric's chronicle is not so obvious, although there are some resemblances.[223] One should notice that, unlike Baldric's description, the letter discusses the atrocities and mentions the defilement of the holy places only in passing. It is particularly interesting that Baldric's mention of the churches being turned into stables cannot be found in the letter. Peculiarly enough, this is mentioned in Guibert's summary of the letter.[224] Thus there is clearly a link between Guibert's and Baldric's versions, which is not the letter. Furthermore, all the Benedictines claim that the churches were overtaken by Muslims for their own rituals – another shared detail which is not in the letter. Therefore, it might be that the Benedictines actually used a version of the letter that is different of ours, that they had another similar text discussing about the Muslim aggression, or that they simply made use of some oral sources.

The letter is certainly suspicious, and it is not generally agreed to be what it claims. Instead, the scholars have suspected that it was forged by the western propagandists, possibly in the context of Bohemond's recruiting drive in 1105–1106.[225] This interpretation has been contested by Peter Frankopan who argues that the letter is genuine indeed, and that it truly reflects the Byzantine activity to promote a military expedition in their defence.[226] Be as it may, this would support the possibility that the Benedictines did not draw directly or exclusively on the letter. On the other hand, if the letter is not genuine and the horrible tales were not common knowledge, then there

---

[220] "Quid dicam de nefanda mulierum construpratione, de qua loqui deterius est quam silere?" RM I.i (728a–b). The phrase is a *paralepsis* (lat. *praeteritio/occultatio*). See *Rhetorica ad Herennium* IV.xxvii.37.

[221] "Totius denique nominis reverentia christiani prostibulo tradebatur, cumque sexui femineo non parcitur – quod tamen excusari poterit pro compententi natura –, in masculinum, pecualitate transgressa, solutis humanitatum legibus itur. Unde, ut unius execranda et penitus intolerabili auribus maiestate flagitii illa, quae in mediocres et infimos defurebat, petulantia panderetur, dicit quendam eos abusione sodomitica interemisse episcopum." GN I.v.468–476.

[222] Sweetenham 2005, 218.

[223] Sweetenham 2005, 217–218.

[224] GN I.v.451–453.

[225] Sweetenham 2005, 215–218. See also the discussion in Introduction.

[226] Frankopan 2004, 3–5.

certainly was a common agreement behind the Benedictine narratives because all the versions are so similar with each other.

The most important point for our discussion, however, is that all the Benedictines described the aggression by Muslims as desecration of the holy places. Baldric explains that the Gentiles defiled the holy city of Antioch, as they had done with Jerusalem. "A stench of their action rose up to the heavens and provoked the fury of God upon them",[227] he writes and continues by declaring that "*the house of prayer* has been made *a den of thieves*".[228] In this manner, Baldric creates an analogy between the current events and those of the New Testament, as he refers to the passage of Gospel where Jesus expels merchants from the temple of God and cleanses it of profane activity.[229] Like Christ himself, the crusaders were supposed to purge the holy places of impurity and of sinful contamination by infidels. As reported by Guibert, the pope exhorted his audience to "cleanse the holiness of the city and the glory of the tomb, which has been polluted by the thick crowd of pagans"[230] and to "purify the place whence you received the cleansing of baptism and the proof of faith"[231]. This is what ultimately justified the armed expedition in the name of Christ: that the Muslims had perpetrated to an unprovoked attack against Christians.

Given that the crusaders were supposed to undo the defilement of the holy places and that the narratives are full of carnage an association might follow that the bloodshed was directly related to this purification.[232] Particularly striking is the depiction of bloodshed in the Temple of Salomon.[233] Under normal conditions, blood-letting in sacred places would have been considered blasphemous.[234] But as none of the writers

---

[227] "Jam enim gentiles usque Antiochiam imperium suum dilataverant; et similiter ipsius sanctae civitatis loca gloriosa foedaverant. Iccirco irritaverant in se furorem Omnipotentis, quoniam operum suorum foetorem emiserant in coelum." BB I.iii (12d–e). See also BB I.iv (13c–).

[228] "…*Domus orationis* spelunca latronum facta est…" BB I.ii (11e).

[229] Matthaeus 21:13; Marcus 11:17; Lucas 19:46.

[230] "…summis studiis, fratres karissimi, vobis elaborandum est ut sanctitas civitatis ac sepulchri gloria, quae gentilium frequentatione, quantum in ipsis est, crebro polluitur, si ad auctorem illius sanctitatis et gloriae aspiratis, si ea quae in terra sunt vestigiorum eius signa diligitis, si expetitis, deo vos preeunte, deo pro vobis preliante mundetur." GN II.iv.150–156. Levine's translation.

[231] "…gloriosum vobis videri debet si ei loco repurgium possitis impendere, unde baptismatis purgamentum et fidei documentum vos constitit accepisse." GN II.iv.178–180. Levine's translation

[232] Kangas 2007, 203–204. On the subject of pollution and purification, see Cole 1993, 84–111. I cannot totally agree with Cole's interpretations; firstly because she ignores the obvious dissimiliarities between the eyewitness narratives and the later revisions, and secondly because she considers the purification entirely as a religious act. As I will argue, this kind of interpretation distorts the meanings given in the sources.

[233] The event is recorded in all the sources, with slightly different details. See GF xxxviii (91); BB IV.xiv; RM IX.viii; GN VII.viii, x.

[234] Jews, however, were not allowed to give offerings in any other place than the Temple of Salomon. See Deuternonomium 12:13–14. The original temple, however, was destroyed by the Romans, which is also pointed out by Guibert. See GN VII.x.

condemn it in this context, it has been argued that this was because bloodshed was here regarded purificative in nature; thus, the argument proceeds, it was the ritual blood sacrifice that symbolically cleansed the holy places of sin.[235] Intriguing as it is, this interpretation fails to convince me because of three issues involved. First of all, in order to be apposite the blood sacrifice would have to be innocent. And that is not quite the attribute with which the authors describe the Saracen blood. Secondly, in the Christian tradition, the atonement of God was confined to confession of sins together with the commemoration and imitation of the self-sacrifice of Christ. Threfore, it would be peculiar indeed, if the authors had reverted to the symbolism of the interrupted Jewish rituals. Thirdly, and most importantly, the interpretation of blood sacrifice is simply not supported by the sources.

It is quite illustrating that the Anonymous writes laconically that because of all the slaughtering "we were wading up to ankles in their blood", and then he just moves on with the narrative without giving any meaning for the occasion.[236] Slightly more suggestive is Raymond of Aguilers' comment that, in his opinion, it was only "poetic justice that the place should receive the blood of pagans who blasphemed God there for many years".[237] The suggestion in the sources is nevertheless not that the bloodshed as such would have been purificative in nature, for the blood as a sacrifice is implied only once in all the narratives. In one passage Guibert writes that the crusaders redeemed Jerusalem with their *own* blood.[238] Thus, if there was any sacrifice, it was not Muslim blood, but that of the crusaders which was purificative. This sacrifice, moreover, was believed to cleanse the sins of the crusaders, not the contamination of holy places.

If not ritual sacrifice, then what meaning did the authors give to the bloodshed? Raymond writes that on the day of the conquest of Jerusalem "the sons of apostles claimed the city and the fatherland for God and the fathers".[239] He uses the word *vindicare* which, besides 'claiming something', means also avenging (rightfully) or vindicating the injury conducted against someone.[240] This aspiration to reclaim the holy places and to reinstate the Christian faith is indeed common to all the sources. Baldric,

---

[235] Kangas 2007, 203. Note that in Deuteronomy, God gives instructions to destroy all the infidels before inhabiting the occupied city. This procedure, however, is not related to ritual cleansing but is justified by the (legitimite) intolerance towards other religions. See Deteronomium 7:2–6, 12:2–3, 20:16–18.
[236] "Ibique talis occisio fuit, ut nostri in sanguine illorum pedes usque ad cauillas mitterent." GF xxxviii (91).
[237] "Justo nimirum judicio, ut locus idem eorum sanguinem exciperet, quorum blasphemias in Deum tam longo tempore pertulerat." RA xx (300d–e).
[238] "Igitur Franci, qui sacram suis redemerant cruoribus urbem…" GN VII.xliii.1995–1996.
[239] "In hac eadem die, apostolorum filii Deo et patribus urbem et patriam vindicaverunt." RA xx (300g–h). See also RA x (254h–j), xviii (290g); Throop 2006, 101.
[240] Throop 2006, 43–44.

moreover, asserted that the slaughter of citizens, which was conducted regardless of age or sex, was justified precisely because the victims were guilty of defilement of the holy places.[241] He does not claim that it would have been the blood or violence that had cleansed the holy places. Instead, it was God's justice that followed from the retribution. The subject which all the Benedictines, and to lesser extent also Raymond, are discussing in the context of bloodshed is therefore not sacrifice, but vengeance, as suggested by Susanna Throop.[242]

In the crusade sources, and more generally in the contemporary thought, vengeance consisted of rightful punishment and subsequent restoring of the violated affair.[243] This *iniuria* was the factor that determined the just punishment; thus the nature of cause defined the quality of vengeance. Without an aggression, vengeance was not appropriate. Furthermore, it was considered absolutely wrong to not to punish the violator, as providing retribution for the injured party was deemed a moral duty of the associates. But then, not just anyone could take the vengeance for a right cause. For, it was only the claimant or someone legitimately representing him, i.e. relative, friend, associate or patron, who could impose the rightful punishment.[244]

In this context, it is rather interesting to examine the rhetoric of Baldric's version of the papal sermon. According to him, the pope thundered that "Christian blood, redeemed by the blood of Christ, is being shed, and Christian flesh, akin to the flesh of Christ, is subjected to unspeakable degradation and servitude."[245] Baldric's delineation of the eastern Christians as "blood-brothers" and "companions" is rather specific.[246] They are depicted in terms of fraternal love, *caritas*, and the effect is amplified with an emotional style (*pathos*): "More suffering of our brethren and devastation of churches remains than we can speak at the same time, for we are oppressed by tears and groans, sighs and sobs."[247] The point is that the crusaders were supposed to bring aid for their

---

[241] "Tanto siquidem odio persequebantur eos, quia Templum Domini et Sancti Sepulchri ecclesiam et Templum Salomonis et alias ecclesias suis usibus illicitis peculiaverant ac indecenter contaminaverant." BB IV.xiv (102e–f).
[242] Throop 2006.
[243] This can be seen already on the etymological level of the words *vindicare* and *ulciscor*, which both have the meanings of 'avenging' and 'punishing'. The former means also 'claiming' and 'liberating', thus having even more obvious connotation with rightful action. For these terms discussed in the contemporary context see Throop 2006, 43–71. More specifically, vengeance in the context of the first-crusade narratives, see ibid., 98–124 et passim. The subject is discussed also in Kangas 2007, 220–224 and Flori 1998, 188–.
[244] Throop 2006, 44–61.
[245] "Effunditur sanguis Christianus, Christi sanguine redemptus; et caro Christiana, carni Christi consanguinea, nefandis ineptiis et servitutibus nefariis mancipatur." BB I.ic (13b).
[246] "fratres nostri, membra Christi…Germani fratres vestri, contubernales vestri, couterni vestri…" RM I.iv (12e–13a).
[247] "Plures supersunt et fratrum nostrorum miseriae, et ecclesiarum Dei depopulationes, quae singulatim

eastern brothers and to defend them against the oppressors.[248] Thus they were in the legitimate position and hence had the authority to retaliate.

One detail which has often gone unnoticed among the scholars is that Guibert actually does not mention the sufferings of the eastern Christians but only those of the (western) pilgrims.[249] As we noticed earlier, also Baldric made an implicit distinction between these two things, discussing them separately. The difference here is that whereas Baldric clearly emphasises the fraternal love towards the fellow Christians, Guibert claims that the eastern Christians actually deserved to be punished.[250] In the first book of his chronicle, Guibert asserts that the eastern Christians[251] had "deserted the authority of the Ancient Fathers" because they were too fond of novelties.[252] Here he refers to the ongoing schism between the western and the eastern Churches (which nevertheless was not necessarily as severe as sometimes thought to be).[253] In Guibert's eyes, the eastern Christians were justly punished because they had deliberately deviated from the true faith.[254]Abandoning one's faith was seen as a violation against God, an *iniuria* that required retribution:

> For since they fell away from faith in the Trinity, like those who fall in the mud and get muddier, little by little they have come to the final degradation of having taken paganism upon themselves; as the punishment for their sin proceeded, foreigners attacked them, and they lost the soil of their native land.[255]

The most severe deviation of the eastern Christians from the doctrine was the denial of the Holy Trinity. Yet Guibert reproached them also for sustaining the habits which were

---

possemus referre: sed instant lacrimae et gemitus, instant suspiria et singultus." BB I.iv (14b). For further discussion about crusading as an act of love, see Riley-Smith 1980, 177–192.

[248] BB I.iv (14h).

[249] GN II.iv.

[250] Compare the following discussion to Riley-Smith 1986, 145, who wrote on the three Benedictines that "…as in the eyewitness accounts, there is no evidence of feelings of animosity towards the Greek people in general. Alexius' government came in for abuse and his subjects were despised as effimenate, but in no sense were they regarded as heretics." As we see, quite the opposite is true on Guibert, though not on the other two.

[251] "…de Iherosolimitanae vel Orientalis statu qui tunc erat aecclesiae..." GN I.i.122–123.

[252] "Orientalium autem fides cum semper nutabunda constiterit et rerum molitione novarum mutabilis et vagabunda fuerit, semper a regula verae credulitatis exorbitans, ab antiquorum Patrum auctoritate descivit…et, dum maiorum sive coevorum suorum despiciunt obtemperare magisterio, *scrutati sunt iniquitate, defecerunt scrutantes scrutinio*: inde hereses et pestium variarum genera portentuosa, quarum tanta pernities et inextricabilis extitit laberintus, ut veprium vel etiam utricarum feracior uspiam fieri nequaquam incultissima possit humus." GN I.ii.130–133, 136–142; Psalmi 63:7.

[253] See Nicol 2008 (1962), 187–206.

[254] "At quoniam offendiculum ponit deus coram his qui voluntarie peccant, terra eorum ipsos sui habitatores evomuit, dum primo fiunt a noticia verae credulitatis exortes ac merito deinde a iure omnis suae terrenae possessionis extorres." GN I.ii.197–201; cf. Ezechiel 3:20; and Leviticus 18:25.

[255] "Dum enim a Trinitatis fide desciscunt ut adhuc sordescant qui in sordibus sunt, paulatim usque ad extrema suscipiendae gentilitatis detrimenta venerunt et, procedente pena peccati, aliegenis irruentibus etiam solum patriae amiserunt..." GN I.ii.201–205; cf. Apocalypsis 22:11. Levine's translation.

morally unacceptable: priests were married, slavery was endorsed, and young girls commonly forced into prostitution.[256] Of these, Guibert blamed above all the Byzantine Emperor, who had the legal and moral responsibility for governing the Eastern Church.[257] Hence, the Muslim invasion is seen as a rightful implementation of God's judgement. This is an example of rather typical interpretation of paternal love, love that chastises from sin and guides to the right path.[258] Yet, the Muslims as well were guilty of violation, for, as we already saw, they had allegedly desecrated the holy places and conducted terrible atrocities against pilgrims. Therefore, it was justified to avenge them. This is why the slaughter of Muslims was considered appropriate: "God repaid them who had inflicted such pain and death upon the pilgrims…by exacting retribution equal to their hideous crimes".[259]

Riley-Smith argued that the original message, set forth in Clermont, was later distorted in the minds of laymen. According to him, the crusaders conceived the message by their own ideas and understood it as a blood feud. The argument is supported by the fact that during the crusade the participants persecuted not only Muslims but Jews as well, suggesting that the crusaders failed or refused to distinguish between these two groups.[260] The problem of this view is that the eyewitness accounts are very silent about the theme of vengeance. Throop has pointed out that aside from Raymond, none other author even hinted towards this interpretation.[261] According to her, the theme emerged only in the later revisions and grew in importance towards the end of the twelfth century. [262]

If vengeance did not belong to the original message or the eyewitness accounts, why then would the later rewriters portray the crusade as retaliation? Partly, the disparity between the eyewitness narratives and the later rewrites may reflect shifts in the current discourses about the meaning of the crusade. But it is also possible that the Benedictines saw the element of retribution as one of the most potential ways to legitimise the expedition. As Throop pointed out, vengeance had solid basis in the Christian tradition. [263] In this respect, there is a significant inconsistency between the

---

[256] GN I.ii.211–235.
[257] "Dum haec sordidissimus ille tirannus ediceret, meminisse debuerat quod ob hoc ipsum haec sibi suisque adversitas potissimum ingrueret…Qui ergo dampnaverit ultro sua, iam querere merito cogitur aliena." GN I.v.530–532, 541–542.
[258] See Riley-Smith 1980, 177–192.
[259] "…deo eis referente vicem, qui tot pro se peregrinantium penas et mortes…digna nequissimis retributione restituit." GN VII.x.450–453. Levine's translation.
[260] Riley-Smith 1986, 48–57; see also Kangas 2007, 221.
[261] Throop 2006, 100–102.
[262] Throop 2006, 103–105, 124 et passim.
[263] Throop 2006, 61–68. Instances of verbs *ulcisci* and *vindicare* with their derivatives are countless in the

Old and the New Testaments, as the vengeance is a prominent theme only in the former – a fact which the educated Benedictines were most likely far more aware of than the less educated clerics who wrote the eyewitness accounts. It is no wonder then that the Benedictines quite habitually draw on the passages of Old Testament. For example, Robert described the power of God by quoting Deuteronomy:

> I will kill and I will make to live: I will strike, and I will heal, and there is none that can deliver out of my hand. If I shall whet my sword as the lightning, and my hand take hold on judgment: I will render vengeance to my enemies, and repay them that hate me. I will make my arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh.[264]

Powerful passages like this one gave the Benedictines persuasive and authoritative material for highlighting the crusade as a divine retribution, a corrective judgement against those who had sinned. Furthermore, the crusade constituted a supreme case of just warfare (*bellum iustum*): it had a legitimate cause, the most legitimate authority, and a good intention behind the action.[265] This argument was certainly directed to those ecclesiastics who might have doubted the justification of the expedition.

Yet, the theme of vengeance enabled also another line of justification. In the common law, blood feud was an intrisic element of implementing the justice.[266] Describing the crusade in terms of vendetta would thus have been advantageous if the purpose was to legitimise the expedition from a laic point of view. Both Robert and Baldric seem to have reached into this direction. In his account of the papal sermon in Clermont, Robert relates vividly how the Saracens killed Christians in different ways:

> When they feel like inflicting a truly painful death on some, they pierce their navels, pull out the end of their intestines, tie them to a pole and whip them around it until, all their bowels pulled out, they fall lifeless to the ground. They shoot arrows at others tied to stakes; others again they attack having stretched out their necks, unsheathing their swords to see if they can manage to hack off their heads with one blow. And what can I say about the appalling treatment of women, which it is better to pass over in silence than to spell out in detail?[267]

Old Testament. Against this, there are very few examples of these words in the New Testament.

[264] "*Ego occidam, et ego vivere faciam; percutiam, et ego sanabo; et non est qui de manu mea possit eruere. Si acuero ut fulgur gladium meum, et arripuerit judicium manus mea, reddam ultionem hostibus meis, et his qui oderunt me retribuam. Inebriabo sagittas meas sanguine, et gladius meus devorabit carnes.*" RM VI.xii (812d); Deuteronomium 32:39, 41–42.

[265] On just war theory from Augustine to Aquinas, see Russel 1975; for the Judeo-Christian tradition, Kangas 2007, 55–60.

[266] Bloch 1982, 123–130.

[267] "Et quos eis placet turpi occubitu multare, umbilicum eis perforant, caput vitaliorum abstrahunt, ad stipitem ligant et sic flagellando circumducunt, quoadusque, extractis visceribus, solo prostrati corruunt. Quosdam stipiti ligatos sagittant; quosdam extento collo et nudato gladio appetunt et utrum uno ictu

Thus, in addition to images of intentional pollution of the sacred places, Robert creates an impression of unreasonable torture and violence. The imagery is clearly employed in order to invoke repulsiveness and hatred (*pathos*) among the audience. Next, the pope appeals his audience to take the vengeance: "So to whom falls the duty of avenging this [violence] and recovering these [lands] if not to you"?[268] Moreover, in another place Robert writes that Duke Godfrey "was desperate to make the enemy pay for the blood of the servants of God which had been spilt around Jerusalem, and wanted revenge for the insults they had heaped on pilgrims".[269] In Baldric's version, the message of vendetta is even more explicit. According to him, the ecclesiastics preached the following to the army before the walls of Jerusalem:

> I address this fathers, sons, brothers, and nephews: if an outsider were to strike down any of your kin, would you not avenge your blood-relative? How much more ought you to avenge your God, [who is] your father, your brother, and whom you see reproached, banished from his estates, crucified; whom you hear calling, desolate, and begging for aid?[270]

After this, the preachers thunder the words of Isaiah, saying "I have trodden the winepress alone, and of the Gentiles there is not a man with me".[271] What is left for the memory of the reader is the latter part of the biblical verse: "I have trampled on them in my indignation, and have trodden them down in my wrath, and their blood is sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my apparel. For the day of vengeance is in my heart, the year of my redemption is come".[272] Sometimes it is effective to omit the most obvious, if the audience can be led to it by other means.

In addition to the features discussed above, Robert saw the crusade as a contest between the true God and false deities. This is manifested by his recurring description of the crusaders as the "soldiers of Christ" fighting against the "followers of the

---

truncare possint pertentant. Quid dicam de nefanda mulierum construpratione, de qua loqui deterius est quam silere?" RM I.i (727e–728b). Sweetenham's translation.

[268] "Quibus igitur ad hoc ulciscendum, ad hoc eripiendum labor incumbit, nisi vobis…" RM I.i (728b).

[269] "Dux vero Godefridus…sagninem servorum Dei, qui in circuitu Iherusalem effusus fuerat, ab eis vidicare satagebat; et irrisiones et contumelias quas peregrinis intulerant, ulcisci cupiebat." RM IX.viii (868a–b). Sweetenham's translation.

[270] "Patribus et filiis et fratribus et nepotibus dico: numquid si quis externus vestrum aliquem percusserit, sanguinem vestrum non ulciscemini? Multo magis Deum vestrum, patrem vestrum, fratrem vestrum ulcisci debetis: quem exprobrari, quem proscribi, quem crucifigi videtis; quem clamantem et desolatum et auxilium poscentem auditis…" BB IV.xiii (101f–g). Translation modified from Riley-Smith 1986, 48–49.

[271] "Torcular calcavi solus, et de gentibus non est vir mecum…" Isaias 63:3.

[272] "…calcavi eos in furore meo, et conculcavi eos in ira mea: et aspersus est sanguis eorum super vestimenta mea, et omnia indumenta mea inquinavi. Dies enim ultionis in corde meo; annus redemptionis meae venit." Isaias 63:3–4.

Devil".[273] In his account of the Council of Clermont, Robert writes that Pope Urban preached that "the race of Persians, a foreign people, a people utterly alienated from God, indeed *a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not faithful to God*" had invaded the lands of the eastern Christians, devastating them by slaughter, plunder and arson.[274] As we see, Robert was extremely hostile towards the Muslims: they were infidels, enemies, and hence entirely demonised. Aside from the recurring animal metaphors underlining their wickedness,[275] the Muslims are also defined as the "sons of the Devil" and the "followers of the Antichrist".[276] According to Robert, the last adversary in the story, "Clement the demented" [277] – described also as "writhing serpent and slippery eel" – aspired to destroy all Christians from the Earth.[278] After being defeated by the crusaders, he began to lament, "O Mahommed, our Master and protector, where is your strength?...[evidently] the power of the Crucified One is greater than yours because he is powerful on earth and in heaven."[279] In Robert's eyes, the crusade truly was a war between Christianity and Islam – God and the Devil.

This confrontation is put forth somewhat differently in Guibert's narrative. He is just as scornful towards Muslims,[280] but for him the crusade was not yet the ultimate battle against the Devil. Though, it certainly anticipated the Apocalypse. He believed that the arrival of the Antichrist was at hands: "According to Daniel and Jerome his interpreter, his tent will be fixed on the Mount of Olives, and he will certainly take his seat, as the Apostle teaches, in Jerusalem, *in the temple of God, as though he were God*..."[281] According to Guibert, the Apocalypse was truly coming, and if Jerusalem as the main scene of action were not restored into the true faith, there would be no one to

---

[273] See for example RM IX.xx (876f): "…sic milites Christi satellites Diaboli destruerent…"

[274] "…gens regni Persarum, gens extranea, gens prorsus a Deo aliena, *generatio* scilicet *quae non direxit cor suum, et non est creditus cum Deo spiritus ejus*, terras illorum Christianorum invaserit, ferro, rapinis, incendio depopulaverit…" RM I.i (727d–e); Psalmi 77:8.

[275] See for example RM VI.viii (809c), *rabidos canes,* and VII.xii (832a–b) where they "swarm like flies on rotting matter": *Sicut enim putredini muscae confluere solent, sic et ipsi undique conveniebant.*

[276] RM IV.xvi (784e–f), VII.viii (828c).

[277] Historically, Caliph al-Musta'li of Fatimid Egypt. Sweetenham 2005, 204 n. 29. Latin *demens* means 'mad', thus the wordplay does not work as well in translation.

[278] RM IX.xiii (871c), xviii (875c); cf. Apocalypsis 12:9.

[279] "O Mathome, praeceptor noster et patrone, ubi est virtus tua? …major est virtus Crucifixi quam tua: quoniam ipse potens est in coelo et in terra." RM IX.xxi (877–878). Sweetenham's translation. The lament can be found also in the *Gesta* and the other rewrites but it is different in content and style. See GF xxxix (96–97); BB IV.xxi; GN VII.xix.

[280] Guibert describes them as "heap of rabble" (*vilissimus vulgus*), "rabbits" (*lepores*), "savages" (*feroces*), and "pile of husks, little creatures who are hardly men at all" (*aggestum palearum, tantillos videlicet ac pene nullos homines*), just to name few random examples. See GN III.x.571, 580, 600, 603.

[281] "...iuxta enim Danielem et Iheronimum Danihelis interpretem fixurus est in Oliveti Monte tentoria, et Iherosolimis, in Dei templo,tanquam sit Deus certum est apostolo docente quod sedeat…" GN II.iv.190–193; see ad Thessalonicenses II 2:4.

resist the Antichrist.[282] Neither of these features – the demonisation of enemy nor the apocalyptic visions – can be found in Baldric's narrative.

In conclusion, the Benedictines saw the crusade as a legitimate, retributive, and divine, counter-offensive in order to reclaim the holiest city on Earth. In this, they fundamentally agreed with the Anonymous but made significant enhancements on the meaning of the expedition – especially considering the justification of it. The explanations given in the Benedictine narratives are substantially similar but not identical. One of the common features between the narratives is that the Benedictine authors obviously imagined audiences, contemporary or future, who might have had at least some doubts about the reasons and legitimacy of the crusade.

[282] "...et si Antichristus ibidem christianum neminem, sicuti hodie vix aliquis habetur, inveniat, non erit qui sibi refragetur aut quem iure pervadat." GN II.iv.188–190. See also VII.xxi.

3. Authority

3.1 The Papal Initiative

As mentioned in Chapter 2.1, the most significant interpolation by the Benedictines into the anonymous narrative was the addition of the Council of Clermont. At the opening of the *Gesta Francorum*, the Anonymous describes how "a great stirring of heart" (*motio ualida*) inspired all faithful to hasten towards Jerusalem.[283] Even though he relates that also the pope had crossed the Alps and begun to "deliver eloquent sermons, and to preach", the impression is that the crusade was a popular religious movement. Moreover, in the *Gesta*, this passage is the only suggestion for papal contribution to the crusade. This was apparently a serious issue for the Benedictines. Of the other eyewitnesses, Peter Tudebode followed the Anonymous almost verbatim,[284] whereas Raymond of Aguilers began his account without any mention of the origins of the expedition.[285] Against this, it is noteworthy that Fulcher of Chartres provided an extensive account of the council.[286] Fulcher knew both of these narratives and used them in his chronicle.[287] Thus, his version should be seen as a response to them. This of course applies also to the Benedictine narratives, although we do not know whether or not they knew also Raymond's version. Similarly, at least Guibert's narrative should be compared with Fulcher's version because he knew it in its early redaction, as mentioned in Introduction. Moreover, all three Benedictines wrote at the time when Fulcher's early redaction was circulating in Europe, and it is therefore possible that also the other two monks were acquainted with it. Hence, we should examine all these versions together.

At the beginning of his narrative, Fulcher writes that while Henry "the so-called emperor" ruled in Germany and King Philip in France "evils of all kinds multiplied throughout Europe because of vacillating faith".[288] At the same time in Rome, however, Pope Urban II, "a man admirable in life and habits…strove prudently and vigorously to rise the status of the holy church ever higher and higher".[289] Fulcher asserts that the pope, after perceiving the bellicose turmoil in Europe and having heard that the Turks had been occupying and devastating the lands of the Byzantine Empire, was "greatly

[283] GF i (1–2).
[284] PT i (9–10).
[285] RA i (235). This is peculiar because Raymond was adjoined with the papal legate Adhemar on the crusade, and as a canon of Le Puy, he must have known the importance of the council. France has proposed that he might have thought that the council was sufficiently well known, see France 1998a, 52.
[286] FC I.i–iv.
[287] Hagenmeyer 1913, 65–70.
[288] "Henrico imperatore dicto…cum in universis Europiae partibus mala multimoda vacillante fide inolescerent…", FC I.i.1. Ryan's translation
[289] "…praeerat urbi Romae papa secundus Urbanus, vir egregius vita et moribus, qui ecclesiae sanctae statum semper sublimius provehendum, super omnia consulte ac strenue moderari sategit." FC I.i.1.

moved by compassionate piety". Thus, "by the prompting of God's love", he called a council to be held in Clermont.[290] There he, "the supreme pontiff and by the permission of God prelate of the whole world"[291], delivered "an elaborate sermon" about the current state of the Christendom. In comparison with the anonymous narrative, Fulcher puts forth a fairly different interpretation of the beginnings of the expedition. Instead of reacting to a popular urge and affiliating a movement already existent, Urban is deeply moved by the current situation and acts actively according to his discretion.

The papal initiative is further confirmed by building up the pope's personal authority. This is done by two approaches. Firstly, it is stressed by the narrative structure: the audience responses to the papal sermon repeatedly with a mix of enthusiasm and obedience.[292] Secondly, the impression is supported by an explicit celebration of Urban's excellence. For example, Fulcher concludes his account of Clermont with the following verse:

> Taliter Urbanus, vir prudens et venerandus,
> Est meditatus opus, quo postea floruit orbis.[293]
>
> (In such a manner Urban, a wise man and reverenced
> Meditated a labour whereby the world flowered.)

Thus Fulcher leaves no doubt that it was the pope who initiated the crusade. In this respect, all the Benedictines followed the same thread; each of them represents Urban as the pivotal player of the Council of Clermont. Unlike Fulcher, Baldric did not explicitly celebrate Urban's eminence. Yet by constructing a rhetorically subtle sermon and by accrediting it to the pope, he clearly contributed to the papal authority.[294] Furthermore, he writes that the audience was so impressed by the sermon that some were touched to tears and others trembled.[295] Similarly, Robert relates that after the sermon, a certain cardinal Gregory lay prostrate on the ground, and then everyone beating their chests appealed for the absolution of their sins.[296] In their eyes, it was the papal meditation, approval and blessing, with which the expedition began. This interpretation is most elaborate in Guibert's version.

---

[290] "…pietate compatienti dilectionisque Dei nutu permotus…"FC I.i.3.
[291] "…apostolatus apice, Dei permissu orbi terrae praelatus…tanquam monitionis divinae legatus", FC I.ii.1. Ryan's translation.
[292] FC I.iii.1, iv.1.
[293] FC I.iv.6.
[294] BB I.iv–v (12–16).
[295] "…his qui aderant luculenter anitimatis, alii fundebantur ora lacrimis; alii trepidabant, alii super hac re disceptabant." BB I.5 (15g–h).
[296] RM I.iii (730a–c).

At the opening of his second book, Guibert recalls Urban's personal history and his achievements – in the similar mode than he later does with all the prominent leaders of the crusade.[297] He also reports the miracles taking place after Urban's death, which he took as a proof of his powers.[298] Guibert writes that the pope was greeted in France with delight because "no one alive could remember when the bishop of apostolic see had come to these lands", suggesting that the presence of the pope was an exceptional honour.[299] Then he continues by claiming that Urban was not afraid of King Philip, even though he had now arrived into his power sphere. Instead, the pope excommunicated the king for denying his wife Berta and remarrying with Bertrada, who was currently in wedlock to the count of Anjou.[300] Aside from the endeavour to confirm the papal sovereignty, Guibert, like Fulcher and the two other Benedictines, reinforced Urban's authority as a person. Guibert praises the pope for the way of how he presided over the crowd "with serene gravity" and "with a dignified presence", as well as how he "listened gently to the most vehemently argued speeches". "With what *peppery eloquence* the most learned pope answered whatever objections were raised", Guibert writes quoting the fifth-century Gallo-Roman bishop Sidonius Apollinaris, known of his ornate style.[301] Finally, before proceeding to the actual sermon, Guibert lays emphasis on the literary sophistication and the wits of the pope:

> His eloquence was reinforced by his literary knowledge; the richness of his speech in Latin seemed no less than that of any lawyer nimble in his native language. Nor did the crowd of disputants blunt the skill of the speaker. Surrounded by praiseworthy teachers, apparently buried by clouds of cases being pressed upon him, he was judged to have overcome, by his own literary brilliance, the flood of oratory and to have overwhelmed the cleverness of every speech.[302]

Clearly then, all three Benedictines strove to build up the papal authority and Urban's

---

[297] GN II.xii–III.ii.
[298] GN II.i.
[299] "Papa igitur, regni nostri fines ingrediens, tanta urbium, oppidorum, villarumque letitia et concursione excipitur, quanto omnium qui adviverent memoriis incompertum fuerat quod aliquando apostolicae sedis antistes in regiones has venisse videretur." GN II.ii.80–84. Levine's translation.
[300] GN II.iii.100–107.
[301] "Erat ibi spectare quam serena gravitate, ponderosa comitate presideret et, ut prefati Sidonii verbis utar, quam *piperata facundia* ad obiecta quaelibet papa disertissimus detonaret. Notabatur quanta vir clarissimus modestia tolerabat suas tumultuose causas ingerentium loquacitatem…", GN II.ii.94–99.
[302] "Eius enim scientiae litterali eloquentiae cooperabatur agilitas, non enim minor ei videbatur in Latinae prosecutione locutionis ubertas quam forensi cuilibet potest esse in materno sermone pernicitas. Nec altercantium multitudo obtundebat contionantis ingenium, sed licet predicabilium grammaticorum elegantiis ambiretur et causarum emergentium nebulis offundi videretur, et oratorum superexundare copias ac sermonum quorumcumque facetias superequitare litterali luculentia putabatur." GN II.iii.111–119. Levine's translation.

central role as the initiator of the crusade. In this, their narratives differ from Fulcher's only in means. Yet, in this respect, these four accounts differ substantially from the rest of the crusade narratives – Albert of Aachen, who probably began his chronicle shortly after the crusade but published it only after the 1120s, even claimed that the initiative for the crusade came from Peter the Hermit who had received the message from God in a vision.[303] This might reflect his negative attitude towards the papacy, as Aachen belonged to the Holy Roman Empire, which was contesting against the papal authority. [304] On the other hand, it can also imply that the papal iniative was not so self evident to the contemporary authors as the modern scholars sometimes tend to think.

In Fulcher's narrative, the concern was not only about the eastern expedition. In fact, he wrote that Urban was worthy of praise because "he restored the peace and re-established the rights of the Church in their former condition, and also made a vigorous effort to drive out the pagans from the lands of Christians".[305] Only the latter subject is directly connected to the crusade, but it is the former that fills the most of Fulcher's account of the council. In order to appreciate this notion, we have to take a brief examination of Fulcher's version.

According to Fulcher, Urban addressed his sermon to the "dearest brethren". By this Urban meant the clergy, who by Fulcher's wording were "the stewards of the ministry of God", "the shepherds", and "the salt of the earth".[306] It is noteworthy that the audience is here completely different from that of the anonymous version. It is not "the Franks" in general to whom the pope spoke, but the upper clergy that participated in the ecclasiastical synod. According to Fulcher, the pope reproached them for being incapable of guarding their "flock" against the "wolf".[307] In his sermon, the multitude of ordinary Christians, the "ignorant", is considered to be at risk to become "rotten" by "worms" unless the clergy applies its "corrective salt of wisdom" on it.[308] Veiled into biblical metaphors which evolve into allegories, the message is that it is the clerical *ordo* itself that should be revived in faith as well as in *mores*:

> But one that salteth ought to be prudent, farseeing, modest, learned, peacemaking, truthseeking, pious, just, equitable, and pure. For how can the unlearned make others learned, the immodest others modest, and the impure

[303] AA.I.ii-v. On Peter, see also next chapter in this study.
[304] Edgington 1998, 59.
[305] "nam pacem renovavit, ecclesiaeque iura in modos pristinos restituit; sed et paganos de terris Christianorum instinctu vivaci effugare conatus est." FC I.iv.6.
[306] "dispensatores ministeriorum Dei", "pastores", "sal estis terrae", respectively. FC I.ii.1–5.
[307] FC I.ii.4.
[308] FC I.ii.5–6.

> others pure? If one hates peace, how can one bring about peace? Or if one has soiled hands, how can he cleanse those who are soiled of other pollution? For it is read, “If a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit”. Accordingly, first correct yourself so that then without reproach you can correct those under your care. [309]

Here Fulcher portrays Urban as discussing the clerical leadership and the morals in depth. In his text, the Council of Clermont is tightly associated with the papal and clerical reformation of the eleventh and the twelfth centuries, in which the reformers pursued to enforce certain way of life upon the clergy. But before anything, the movement considered the autonomy of the Church.[310] Not surprisingly then, also this theme runs through Fulcher's account. “Especially see to it”, the pope admonished his audience, “that the affairs of the Church are maintained according to its law so that simoniacal heresy in no way takes root among you”.[311] In addition to this, he demanded that the Church should be hold “entirely free from secular power”.[312] By this, Fulcher refers to the ongoing struggle of the papacy to cease the secular intervention in the episcopal elections. More generally, this “investiture contest/controversy” was about the limits of the profane and secular powers, in medieval terms it was a struggle between the Church (*sacerdotium*) and the state (*regnum*).[313]

Having finished the moral sermon, Urban turns to the concrete issue of violence and anathematises everyone assailing the clergy, the pilgrims, or the traders, as well as all those who seize another's property. Then, addressing the clergy, he points out that the disorder might be due to their own “weakness in administering justice”.[314] Thus again, Urban reminds the clerics of their duty as the moral wardens of the Christendom. Finally, he declares that it is necessary to restore “the peace” (*trevia*), which “the holy

---

[309] “sed huiusmodi sallitorem oportet esse prudentem, provisorem, modestum, edoctum, pacificum, scrutatorem, pium, justum, aequum, mundum. nam quomodo indoctus doctos, inmodestus modestos, inmundus mundos efficere valebit? quod si pacem oderit, quomodo pacificabit? aut si quis habuerit manus sordidatas, quomodo sordes alterius coinquinationis tergere poterit? lectum est etiam, quia si *caecus caecum duxerit*, ambobus *cavea patebit*. ceterum vos ipsos prius corrigite, ut inreprehensibiliter subditos vestros queatis emendare.” FC I.ii.7; Matthaeus 15:14; Lucas 6:39.

[310] On the moral requirements for the clergy, especially the sexual morality, see Murray 2004, 24–42; Elliott 1997, 1–23; and more generally, Brundage 1987. For the reform movement, see Cowdrey 1970a, 135–156; and Morris 1991, 79–108.

[311] “res ecclesiasticas praecipue in suo iure constare facite, ut et simoniaca haeresis nullatenus apud vos radicet…”, FC I.ii.9. Ryan’s translation.

[312] “…omnimode liberam ab omni saeculari potestate…”, FC I.ii.10.

[313] Morris 1991, 109–134, 154–176.

[314] "…per inbecillitatem forsitan iustificationis vestrae…", FC I.ii.13. Compare to BB I.ix (19e) where Baldric expounds the mere notion of priests comforting the troops into a sermon, “…Si vos modo non exaudierit, culpa nostra est; si vos non respexerit, nostra est negligentia. Reminiscamini quoniam graviter eum offendimus, et irritavimus, qui in rerum fraternarum rapacitate et in ecclesiarum destructione inexplebiliter grassati sumus.” Interestingly then, Baldric also saw that if the “flock” did not follow the instructions, the blame fall upon the “shepherd”.

fathers long time ago established".[315] In this passage, we have an explicit reference to the earlier peace movement, which the Church initiated in the late tenth century and which was widely affiliated by the laity.[316] What Fulcher asserted, was that in Clermont the pope summoned up the old idea of the Peace of God.

Fulcher was thus concerned about three things: the autonomy of the Church, the pacification of the Christendom, and the supervisory role of the clergy. Strikingly, none of the three Benedictines followed Fulcher here. This cannot have been but a deliberate decision, for Robert and Baldric certainly knew what the council was about, whereas Guibert was unsure considering the facts of it. Yet, even he apparently knew that the council was important setting for the crusade.[317] We have no official records of the council, and these four versions are the only complete accounts of it.[318] According to some incidental notes and the fragmentary synopses it seems probable that the council dealt mostly with the ecclesiastical affairs, i.e. the rights and the behaviour of the clergy, the restriction of violence and the limits of secular interference.[319] Strikingly, all these are topics which Fulcher discussed in his narrative and the Benedictines did not.

Now, regardless of whether or not the Benedictines knew Fulcher's account, it seems that the Benedictines intentionally aspired to de-emphasise these themes of the original council. But why? No doubt the Benedictines supported the reform movement. Hence it is hardly the case that they had regarded these topics unimportant as such.[320] Therefore, it seems likely that for some reason they saw the discussion of these topics irrelevant at this point of the narrative. Given that they apparently wanted to describe

---

[315] FC I.ii.14. See also FC I.iv.2: "pacem, quam dicunt treviam".

[316] In Latin this movement was, of course, called *pax Dei*. According to Charles du Cange, *treuga*, *trevia* or *treva*, is derived from old-German *Trew/Truewe*, 'faith; peace; faithful; true; real'. The scholars tend to make a conceptual difference between *treuga Dei* and *pax Dei*, so that the former, also called as "Truce of God", designates the later, more institutional phase in the movement after 1033. The main difference was that the early movement tried to protect certain classes, whereas the later movement endeavoured to prohibit the violence entirely at certain times. These two aspects merged together by the second half of the century. See Bull 1993, 21–56; Cowdrey 1970b, 42–67. For an overview of the recent study on the subject, see Head & Landes (ed.) 1992.

[317] In his preface, Guibert admits that he did not know the name of Adhémar of Le Puy when he began writing. He also asserts mistakenly that the council was held in 1097. See Huygens 1996, 54.

[318] Fulcher's version has typically regarded as the most reliable of the three versions. It is possible that Fulcher reconstructed the sermon working by notes (which may or may not have been made by him). See Somerville 1974, 104. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Fulcher's account is by no means a *reportatio*, as Cole 1991, 11, has claimed, but throughout rhetorical in nature. Thus, I would seriously question the factual reliability of it. See also Ward 1985, 128. However, for my study, the evidential value of Fulcher's account is merely secondary in importance.

[319] The canons of the Council of Clermont are edited and analysed tentatively in Somerville 1972. For a quick view, see Appendix III, pp. 142–50. There are also some letters that are of use for investigation of the original message. For these sources and discussion, see Ward 1985, 122–126 and n. 61; Riley-Smith 1986, 15–30; Cowdrey 2008, 7–13. In the late eleventh century, there were no official recording practices for canons, see Somerville 1972, 23; Ward 1985, 124.

[320] See Chapter 4.1

the Council of Clermont as the all-important setting for the crusade, it would indeed have been rhetorically disadvantageous to discuss any internal conflicts here. At the same time, they made of the council a major rhetorical vehicle which underlined the significance of the expedition. This reworking of the Council of Clermont demonstrates just how little we can grasp of the original event and the sermon from the later representations.[321]

In order to stress the significance of the papal sermon as the cause of the crusade, the Benedictines clearly manipulated the picture of the Council of Clermont. Thus we cannot rely on these accounts as source for the actual event or the sermon. This is acknowledged in the modern scholarship. Yet, the scholars, being very interested in those parts of the sermon that consider the crusade, have failed to realise the implications of this notion: that the established interpretation according to which the crusade was a brain-child of Pope Urban and that it was launched by papal instigation in Clermont is for most part based on the narratives which were committed with the purpose of stressing this very point. This western distortion is now about to crumble because of the acknowledging of different perspectives – especially the better knowledge of the eastern sources.[322] Consequently, the crusade was not necessarily as much a papal invention as we tend to think it was. Promoting an image of papal initiative and control over the expedition was undoubtedly one of the main aims of the Benedictine narratives. Hence, it should be clear that the role of the papacy was probably overstressed. The question is, how much?

3.2 Leadership

One of the most nebulous sections in the *Gesta* is the introduction of the leaders and the events related to their arrival in Constantinople. Here, it is difficult to follow even the narrative sequence of the events, let alone their chronological succession. This seems to have been somewhat painful for the Benedictines as well, for they all made an effort to improve the structure of this section. The narrative flow was not only important *per se*.

[321] The scholars have sought to reconstruct the original sermon by comparing the different versions of it. For a classical example, see Munro 1906 which has been more or less followed by many, take for example the influential studies of Mayer 1988 (8–9) and Runciman 1980 (106–108). This approach is untenable, for it assumes that the chroniclers aimed for factual veracity (which is an anachronism) and ignores the purposes of these rhetorical texts.

[322] See Frankopan 2004, 1–13 (I have not yet been able to grasp his recent book *The First Crusade. The Call from the East*, which apparently makes the point even more clear). Note that already Erdmann wrote that "In short, there is no need to assume that appeals came from the East otherwise than by the emissaries of Alexius; even though westerners spoke mainly about Jerusalem, the actual impulse [for the Crusade] may well have proceeded from Byzantium." See Erdmann 1977, 365. Cf. Riley-Smith 1986, 13, "The crusade was his [Urban] personal response to an appeal which had reached him from the Greeks eight monts before."

For, it was also relevant for producing an image of a harmonious movement and for promoting the legitimate leadership of the expedition.

The Anonymous writes that the crusaders arrived to Constantinople in three "armies". According to him, Peter the Hermit, Godfrey of Bouillon, and his brother Baldwin led one part of the forces.[323] Then the author continues by relating the affairs which Peter's army encountered.[324] This episode, also known as "the People's Crusade", was rather troublesome in the eyes of the rewriters, for it turned out quite miserably.[325] Hence, it conflicted with the interpretation that the expedition was divinely ordained and supported, and thus it had to be explained away.

According to the Anonymous, Peter's army first marauded in the lands of Constantinople but then they split up because the Franks "were swelling with pride".[326] One part of the army, led by a certain Rainald, ventured into Asia Minor, got beaten by the Turks, suffered from a terrible thirst, and consequently descended to drinking blood and urine. Then Rainald made a pact with the enemy and deserted, leaving the remaining troops to be captured and sold into slavery or brutally slaughtered by the Turks. On the top of that, also the other part of the army, under the command of Walter "Sansavoir"[327] fell prey to the enemy. Thus the army was completely devastated, Walter was dead, and Peter had departed back to Constantinople.

The problem of the account was that it suggested that Godfrey and Baldwin would have been with Peter's army. This is gravely misleading, for Godfrey did indeed follow the same road as Peter – but several months after him. The Anonymous probably knew this because later he describes how "two days before the Birthday of our Lord", Godfrey arrived at Constantinople "with a great army".[328] Yet, because of his narrative sequence, the impression is that both of these "great leaders" would have been with those who ended up in the miserable state of drinking blood and urine – an image that was neither true nor intended. The fact that the narrative was somewhat obscure even for the contemporaries is illustrated by Robert's version of this same episode.

At the beginning of the fifth chapter of Robert's first book, there is a verse lead

---

[323] "Fecerunt denique Galli in tres partes. Vna pars Francorum in Hungariae intrauit regionem, scilicet Petrus Heremita, et dux Godefridus, et Balduinus frater eius, et Balduinus comes de Monte." GF ii (2).
[324] "Petrus uero supradictus primus uenit Constantinopolim…" GF ii (2).
[325] See GF ii (2–5); cf. GN II.viii–xi; BB I.ix–xi; RM I.vi–xiii. For a scholarly analysis of the events, see France 1994, 88–95, who bases much of his analysis on Albert of Aachen's narrative. See AA I.vi–xxx.
[326] "Tandem peruenerunt Nicomediam, ubi diuisi sunt Lombardi et Longobardi, et Alamanni a Francis, quia Franci tumebant superbia." GF ii (3).
[327] Walter of Poissy, also known as " the Pennyless".
[328] "Dux denique Godefridus primus omnium seniorum Constantinopolim uenit cum magno exercitu, duobus diebus ante Domini nostri Natale…" GF iii (6).

saying, "The Duke set out first, but never came back".[329] This cannot but mean Godfrey of Bouillon because he is the only duke being introduced in the chapter. However, because Godfrey did not participate in the People's Crusade, he cannot have been perished in it either. In fact, he got through all the way to Jerusalem where he was elected as the first ruler of the Holy Sepulchre.[330] Certainly, Robert himself would not have done this kind of mistake. It is therefore probable that a later scribe, who was not too familiar with the story, wrote the verse.[331] The scribal mistake suggests that Robert's narration was indeed slightly confusing to the contemporary readers. This was partly due to its reliance on the *Gesta*. Yet, the obscurity might have been even more severe because of some alterations that Robert made into the narrative.

Firstly, Robert introduced Godfrey as the leader of the Teutons (*dux Teuthonicorum*) and claimed, falsely but in accordance with the *Gesta*, that he joined forces with Peter the Hermit.[332] Then, in the next chapter, he begins to relate the ventures of Peter, saying that he was followed by a large band of German people (*cum suis et manga gente Alemannorum*).[333] Furthermore, Robert omits the mention that the others separated from the Franks and continues to call all the troops *Franci*, although according to the *Gesta* they were *Lombardi*, *Longobardi*, and *Alamanni*.[334] Consequently, Godfrey is explicitly associated with the "Germans" who travelled with Peter and implicitly, as a member of *gens Francorum*, with "the Franks" who undertook the action. All this might be due to his misreading of the nebulous narrative of the *Gesta*. It is more likely however that he did this deliberately in order to produce a more unified picture of the army led by the Franks. Whatever the reason, the resulting impression is that Godfrey was with those who ended up miserably. Certainly this was not Robert's intention, for his attitude towards Godfrey was highly positive.[335] Moreover, nowhere does he explicate that Godfrey would have been with Peter's troops when they raided Christians, neither did he claim that Godfrey would have taken part in the later encounters. Still, the result is that the initially obscure narrative structure of the *Gesta Francorum* was made even worse by Robert's endeavour to smooth away the discrepancies of the expedition.

The other two Benedictines dodged the problem simply by introducing

[329] "Dux prior incessit, nec retro postea cessit." RM I.v (731). Sweetenham's translation.
[330] See RM IX.x; and Sweetenham 2005, 202 n. 21.
[331] The verse lead cannot be found in all of the manuscripts. See RHC Occ. vol. 3, 731 n. 19.
[332] RM I.v (731d–e).
[333] RM I.vi (732b–c).
[334] GF ii (3). These terms were not necessarily mutually exclusive, as we will see in Chapter 4.2.
[335] For Robert's portrayal of the Franks, see Chapter 4.2. On Godfrey, see p. 92 below.

Godfrey's troops separately. Baldric did this in the paragraph preceding the events. Then, at the beginning of the subsequent chapter, he writes that "the aforementioned Germans went over to Hungary".[336] Only after this is Peter the Hermit and the following events brought up in the narrative. Consequently, there is no confusion about Godfrey's troops, or of any other of the major leaders, being with Peter, Rainald, or Walter on their unfortunate ventures.[337] Guibert made this separation even more distinct by providing thorough descriptions of all the major leaders, and by inserting these *after* the unfortunate and dubious episode.[338] As a result, clear contrast is created between those who set about in advance but ended up badly and those who followed later but acted out correctly.

This contrast was useful for the Benedictines because it stressed the importance of legitimate leadership. The message is remarkably clear in all the versions. Even in Robert's confusing narrative, the message is well articulated: the pillaging at Constantinople (already labelled "abominable" in the *Gesta*)[339] is clearly explained as having sprung from the lack of leadership:

> The trouble is that any gathering of men which is not well ruled and which lacks firm leadership gets less effective by the day and further from safety. Moreover, these men, lacking as they did a wise prince to lead them, were engaging in reprehensible activities.[340]

Exactly the same rationale is given by Baldric, who wrote that these troops behaved in a disorderly manner because they had no leader and because they were compiled of people from various locations.[341] Guibert, moreover, adds new information about Peter's journey in Hungary, writing that while "the leaders" were summoning their resources for the crusade, "the common people, poor in resources but copious in number" attached themselves to Peter the Hermit and obeyed him "as if he was their teacher".[342] Then, after discussing Peter's personal habits, behaviour, and doctrine,

---

[336] "Transeundum fuit praedictis Alamannis per Hungariam, et transierunt." BB I.ix (18b–c).
[337] BB I.viii (17d–).
[338] GN II.viii–, xii–.
[339] "Ipsique Christiani nequiter deducebant se…"GF ii (3).
[340] "Sed omnis congregatio hominum quae bono auctore non gubernatur, si ei languidum caput principatur, quotidie languescit et a salute elongatur. Propterea et hi, qui prudentem principem qui eorum dominaretur non habebant, reprehensibilia opera faciabant." RM I.vi (732d–e). Sweetenham's translation.
[341] "Gens etenim illa sine rege, sine duce, variis aggregata locis, indisciplinate viventes, in res alienas rapaciter involabant…" BB I.ic (18d–e).
[342] "Principibus igitur, qui multis expensis et magnis obsequentium ministeriis indigebant, sua morose ac dispensative tractantibus, tenue illud quidem substantia sed numero frequentissimum vulgo Petro cuidam Heremitae cohesit eique interim, dum adhuc res intra nos agitur, acsi magistro paruit." GN II.viii.379–384.

Guibert relates the atrocities which his followers committed in Hungary before their arrival at Constantinople:

> …not content with their decency, in a kind of remarkable madness, these intruders began to crush them. As Christians to Christians, they had generously offered everything for sale. Yet those, rampant in lust, ignored their hospitality and generosity, arbitrarily waging war against them, assuming that they would not resist, but would remain entirely peaceful. In an accursed rage they burned the public granaries we spoke of, raped virgins, dishonoured many marriage beds by carrying off many women, and tore out or burned the meads of their hosts. None of them now thought of buying what he needed, but instead each man strove for what he could get by theft and murder…[343]

Although clearly sceptical towards Peter, Guibert does not directly blame him for the occurrence. Nevertheless, he writes that Peter was "unable to restrain this undisciplined crowd of common people, who were like prisoners and slaves".[344] Thus, the explanation for misconducts is, at this point, slightly different than with Robert or Baldric. For Guibert, the deliquencies were committed partly because it was the very nature of the participants. They were *vulgus indocile*, "the ignorant mob",[345] not disciplined soldiers or true pilgrims. Thus, they were immoral.[346] The nature of the participants and their doubtful motivation was one part of the reason for their doom. Another was the lack of proper leadership:

> Since they were not subject to the severity of a king, who might correct their errors with judicial strength, nor did they reflect soberly upon divine law, which might have restrained the instability of their minds, they fell to sudden death, because death comes to meet the undisciplined, and the man who cannot control himself does not last long.[347]

The legitimate leadership required either secular or moral authority, which both,

---

[343] "…non contenti humanitate eorum mira dementia, ipsi alienigenae, ceperunt turpiter conculcare gentiles, et cum idem, utpote Christiani Christianis, venalia cuncta gratanter ingererent, illi, libidinis impatientes, piae hospitalitatis ac beneficientiae immemores bello gratis eos aggrediuntur, dum illos opinantur nichil ausuros contra ac penitus futuros imbelles. Rabie igitur execranda publicis quos diximus horreis per eos ingerebatur incendium, puellis eripiebatur violentia illata virginium, dehonestabantur coniugia crebris raptibus feminarum, vellebant sive ustulabant suis barbas hospitibus, nec iam de emendis usui necessariis quippiam tractabatur, sed quisque eorum prout poterat rapinis et cedibus nitebatur…" GN II.viii.410–422.

[344] "Petrus autem cum illud indisciplinatum vulgus, utpote mancipia et publica servitia…" GN II.ix.434–436. Levine's translation.

[345] GN II.viii.404.

[346] In reality, however, the composition of these troops was probably not much different than that of the main army who set off later. See France 1994, 88, 90, 91, 95; Riley-Smith 1986, 51.

[347] "Dum enim nullius experiuntur severitatem regis, qui iudiciali devios vigore retorqueat, nec divinae reverentiam concipiunt legis, quae mentium levitatem matura recogitatione deprimat, repentino prolabuntur interitu, quia indisciplinatis mors obviat et quicquid pensi moderatique nichil habet, parum durat." GN II.ix.460–466. Levine's translation.

according to Guibert, were clearly lacking here. That is why the undisciplined army committed the atrocities, and therefore they also perished. The argument is continued later, when Guibert writes that "Such was the end of the group under the command of Peter the Hermit. We have followed this story without interrupting it so that we might show that Peter's group in no way helped the others, but in fact added to the audacity of the Turks."[348] As mentioned above, according to some contemporaries it was Peter the Hermit, and not Pope Urban, who instigated the crusade.[349] If Guibert was aware of these rumours, his depiction of Peter's early journeys without the legitimate leaders might have been set about deliberately to blacken Peter's reputation in favour of the papal authority.

Guibert concluded his treatment of the People's Crusade by writing that "now we shall return to the men we have passed over, who followed the same path that Peter did, but in a far more restrained and fortunate way".[350] In all the Benedictine versions, the People's Crusade appears to have been merely an unfortunate skirmish of those who were neither sincere in their motives nor capable of conducting the divine mission. Against this, it is striking how the unity and the legitimate leadership of the main army are constantly stressed. According to Robert's version of the Council of Clermont, the audience responded to the papal sermon consistently by calling: "God wills it! God wills it!"[351] This might indeed have been a chant which the crusaders used during the expedition, as suggested by the Anonymous.[352] Yet, it was probably entirely Robert's invention to insert it here, as it is not suggested in any other sources. The message that this passage makes impossible to disregard is that the uniform reaction was a manifestation of divine approval:

> When the venerable pope had heard this, he raised his eyes to heaven, thanked God and, gesturing with his hand for silence, said: "Dearest brothers, today we have seen demonstrated what Lord says in his Gospel: *where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them*. Had the Lord God not been in your minds, you would not have spoken with one voice; certainly the voices were many, but the thought behind them was as one."[353]

---

[348] "Comitiae Petri Heremitae talis fuit exitus, cuius historiam ideo sine alterius materiae intersticio prosecuti sumus, ut eam aliis nullam impendisse opem sed Turcis addidisse audaciam monstraremus." GN II.xi.603–606. Levine's translation.

[349] See AA I.ii–v for Peter the Hermit as the initiator of the crusade. See also chapters vi–xxx for a lengthy and quite different version of the People's Crusade.

[350] "Nunc itaque ad eos quos omiseramus, qui eadem qua Petrus precesserat subsecuti sunt via, sed longe feliciori modestia, revertamur." GN II.xi.606–609. Levine's translation.

[351] "Deus vult! Deus vult!" RM I.ii (729c).

[352] GF iiii (7).

[353] "Quod ut venerandus pontifex Romanus audivit, erectis in coelum luminibus, Deo gratias egit et manu silentium indicens, ait: 'Fratres carissimi, hodie est in nobis ostensum quod Dominus dicit per

Even though this particular episode cannot be found in the other Benedictine accounts, all the interpretations considering unity are fairly similar: the crusaders were disciplined, motivated, and unanimous in all their actions and decisions.[354] Robert writes that the army "was marching in such a pious and orderly way that none could be found who had suffered [from its passing]".[355] When preparing for battle, the crusaders advanced with closed ranks, "silent as if they were dumb".[356] Baldric highlighted the integrity in a passage where he recounts the story of a horrible famine, during which the crusaders were forced to eat animal skin and leaves.[357] "Yet, none can be said to have wavered; no one grumbled", Baldric adds.[358] In consequence, the army advanced in perfect harmony and discipline:

> Standard-bearers and armed knights led before the main army and protected it from ambushers, supply keepers and equipment carriers followed after, and behind them hurried the main body of the army. Everyone supported each other in their needs…Truly, nothing indiscreet or disorderly was admitted: the undisciplined were corrected, the ignorant instructed, the insurgent reproached; the intemperate were dissuaded from their intemperance, and all together were urged to give alms. Indeed, everyone desired frugality and modesty, and, so to say, the encampment was like a school of morals. This was the manner and the order of those who travelled to Jerusalem. When they thus hold to rigidity of discipline and overflowed with charitable disposition, clearly God consorted with them and fought his war through them. We say this in order to refute the way of living and travelling of those indisciplined men who, in disdainful desire for glory and extolling themselves, followed [after]. For nothing among men is more useful than discipline.[359]

Evangelium: *Ubi duo vel tres congregati* fuerint *in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum*. Nisi Dominus Deus mentibus vestris affuisset, una omnium vestrum vox non fuisset; licet enim vox vestra numerosa prodierit, tamen origo vocis una fuit.'" RM I.ii.(728c–e).

[354] In addition to the examples given below, see for example BB I.xxiv (29a), III.viii (67c–d), III.xi (70g), IV.vii (95b–e); GN III.viii; RM VII.viii.

[355] "Exercitus autem sic devote et seriatim procedebat, quia cui nocerent nullus erant." RM II.iii (740f).

[356] "Quum se bello praeparant...seriatim incedunt, et ac si sine verbo essent, conticescunt." RM III.xvii (765d–e).

[357] GF xxvi (62); BB III.xi (70–71).

[358] "Nemo igitur vera dixisse nos ambigat, nemo submurmuret…" BB III.xi (76g).

[359] "Signiferi et milites armati praecedebant, et toti exercitui ab insidiatoribus praecavebant; subsequebantur sarcinarum provisores et clitellariorum sublevatores; pone properabat ordo militaris, et omnes omnium aderant necessitudinibus…Nihil enim inconsultum, nihil inordinatum admittebant: indisciplinati castigabantur, inscii erudiebantur, rebelles objurgabantur, incontinentes de incontinentia sua redarguebantur, et omnes in commune ad eleemosinam incitabantur. Omnes etiam frugalitati et pudicitiae studebant; et, ut ita dixerim, quaedam schola disciplininae moralis in castris erat: is erat modus et haec erat forma Jerusalem ambulantium. Dum hunc disciplinae rigorem tenuerunt et affectu caritativo redundaverunt, evidenter inter eos Deus conversatus est, et per eos bella sua bellatus est. Haec iccirco dixerimus, quatinus indisciplinatorum illorum, qui huic expetitioni gloriosae superciliosi successerunt, illos extollentes, vitam et viam redarguerimus. Nihil est inter homines utilius disciplina." BB IV.vii (95b–e).

Guibert and Baldric laid also some emphasis on the fact that there were no kings among the crusaders. Baldric wrote in his prologue that this demonstrated the concordant disposition of the forces.[360] In Guibert's opinion, the movement bypassed the monarchs because they were not sincere in their faith.[361] Referring to the words of Solomon, Guibert writes, "the locusts have no king, yet they march together in bands".[362] According to him, this manifested two things: firstly, that the motivation of the crusaders was genuine; and, secondly, that the whole expedition was caused, guided, and commanded by God himself. This is one of the central arguments in his book, as suggested by the very name of it: *Dei gesta per Francos* (The Deeds of God through the Franks).

It is worth noticing that Robert does not emphasise the lack of royal leadership. Moreover, unlike Guibert, Robert is not at all disparaging towards King Philip I. He simply describes Philip, in a very neutral manner, as the ruler of France.[363] Moreover, as noted by Marcus Bull, Robert actually highlights the participation of Hugh of Vermandois (known as *magnus*, "the Great") who was Philip's brother, enhancing thus indirectly the royal prestige.[364] Robert writes that Hugh "was credit to the royal blood from which he sprang because of the integrity of his conduct, his refined bearing, and his courage".[365] He describes Hugh as the legitimate standard-bearer of the army and highlights his role also in many other ways.[366] He even omits the fact that Hugh deserted the crusade while being sent to negotiate with Emperor Alexius at Constantinople, claiming instead that he died after the meeting.[367] The assertion is peculiar because it should have been known both by Robert and his audience that Hugh returned to France yet rehabilitated himself by taking part in the crusade of 1101, during

---

[360] "Quis enim tot principes, tot duces, tot milites, tot pedites sine rege, sine imperatore dimicantes eatenus audivit? neque siquidem, in isto exercitu, alter alteri praefuit, alius alii imperavit: nemo quod sibi peculiare videbatur disposuit, nisi quod sapientium commune consultum decrevit, nisi quod plebi[s]citum collaudavit. Certum est ergo quia Spiritus Sanctus, qui *ubi vult spirat*, et ut tantos labores arriperent eos animavit, atque indiscissam eis concordiam inspiravit." BB, prologus (9); Joannes 3:8.

[361] GN VII.xxxi (250). See also Levine 2008, 141 n. 252.

[362] "*regem locusta non habet et egreditur universa per turmas suas.*" GN I.i.93–94; Proverbia 30:27; "Ipsa [locusta] 'regem non habuit', quia quaeque fidelis anima omni ducatu preter solius dei caruit…" GN I.i.99–100. See also I.i.41–46 and VII.xxiii.1210.

[363] "...qui ipso tempore Franciam suo subjugabat imperio." RM II.i (739b). Compare to GN II.iii. At the time of writing, the relations between the papacy and Philip I had substantially improved, however, without which Guibert's description might have been even more disapproving. See Bull 1996, 27.

[364] Bull 1996, 25–46.

[365] "Hic honestate morum, et elegantia corporis, et animi virtute, regalem de qua ortus erat commendabat prosapiam..." RM II.i (739b). Also Guibert exalted Hugh for his noble parentage as well as his bravery, humility, and temperance. This, however, may be partly due to his knowledge of that Hugh returned and died later "as a martyr". See GN II.xiv; VI.v, viii.193–197, xi.

[366] Bull 1996, 40–42; Sweetenham 2005, 19.

[367] RM VII.xx (837); compare to GF xxx (72) where it is claimed that "he went, but never came back" ("Iuit, nec postea rediit").

which he was wounded and died.[368] Bull suggests that this was a "deliberate, exculpatory lie" in order to exonerate Hugh.[369] The monastery of Rheims was certainly under the royal power sphere, as the French kings were crowned in the Catherdal of Rheims.[370] Therefore, it would be only logical if Robert had written in support of the Capetian monarchy. Nevertheless, this hypothesis lies on a fragile basis. In contrast, there is much more evidence for asserting that Robert and the other Benedictines strived to bolster the papal authority.

As the head of the Christian community, the pope was seen as the supreme religious leader upon the Earth. Hence, the will of God was communicated through him, as demonstrated in the Benedictine accounts of the Council of Clermont. On the journey, however, the official legate, Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy, upheld the papal leadership. The *Gesta Francorum* describes him as one of the leaders, especially in the matters of religion and ritual.[371] In Robert's narrative, Adhémar is frequently depicted as dressed in breastplate, holding the lance of the Saviour, and lecturing in order to raise the morals of the army while all the others listen in total silence.[372] According to Robert, Adhémar was unanimously chosen "to lead and organise the people of God like a second Moses".[373] He is clearly portrayed as the undisputed spiritual authority.

Similarly in Baldric's version, Adhémar is given the mandate directly by the pope. After this, Raymond of Toulouse comes forward and proposes that all who have resources should help those who does not because the army and the people had now been united under single leadership: "Behold, by the grace of God, already two volunteers are about to proceed on the road of Christians. Behold, *sacerdotium et regnum* – the clerical and the laic orders together in order to join under the army of God. Bishop and count, like Moses and Aaron we conceive ourselves again."[374] In the eyes of the Benedictines, the crusade was an expedition which closed the ranks of clergy and laity, uniting them before the holy mission led by God. The authority of such an

[368] Bull 1996, 42; Sweetenham 2005, 19, 176 n. 50.
[369] Bull 1996, 42.
[370] Bull 1996, 40.
[371] GF viii (15), xxiiii (58), xxx (74); but see also Adhémar as a military commander, for example ix (20): "Episcopus uero Podiensis uenit per alteram montanam, undique circumcingens incredulos Turcos", and xxix (68): "In quarta [acie] fuit Podiensis episcopus, portans secum lanceam Saluatoris…"
[372] RM VII.ix–x, VII.xvi.
[373] "Universi vero elegerunt Podiensem episcopum, asserentes eum rebus humanis ac divinis valde esse idoneum, et utraque scientia peritissimum, suisque actionibus multividum. Ille itaque, licet invitus, suscepit, quasi alter Moyses, ducatum ac regimen dominici populi, cum benedictione domini papae ac totius concilii. RM I.iv (731a–b).
[374] "Ecce, Deo gratias, jam Christianis ituris duo ultronei processere viri: ecce sacerdotium et regnum; clericalis ordo et laicalis ad exercitum Dei conducendum concordant. Episcopus et comes, Moysen et Aaron nobis reimaginantur." BB I.v (16d).

expedition attributed to the supreme mediator between God and the people – the papal institution.

4. Images

4.1 The New Knighthood

> You, girt about with the belt of military, you are arrogant with great pride. You rage against your brothers and cut each other in pieces. This is not the army of Christ that rends asunder the sheepfold of the Redeemer. The Holy Church has reserved soldiery for herself to help her people, but you have badly depraved it into malice. Let us confess the truth, whose heralds we ought to be: truly, you are not holding to the way which leads to life. You, oppressers of children, plunderers of widows; you, guilty of homicide, of sacrilege, robbers of another's rights; you who await the pay of thieves for shedding of Christian blood – as vultures smell fetid corpses, so do you sense battles from afar and rush to them eagerly. Certainly, this is the worst way, for it is utterly removed from God! If indeed you wish to be mindful of your souls, either lay down the belt of such military, or advance boldly as the knights of Christ…[375]

This rhetorically elegant excerpt is from Baldric's version of the sermon given in Clermont by Pope Urban II. According to the author, Urban directed this part of his speech to those who carried the "belt of military". The expression is a metaphor for the knightly classes, which the pope reproached for abusing their power to wage war.[376] He regarded them as having succumbed to the sin of pride (*superbia*) and condemned the secular warfare which they embraced. It was deemed both unjust and contrary to the function of military, which was protecting, not oppressing.

This dichotomy, strongly present in Fulcher's account and also discussed by Guibert, is entirely absent in Robert's version of the sermon.[377] According to him, the pope argued that the internal warfare was due to the congestion in Europe – not to the bellicosity of the knightly classes. Moreover, he proposed the armed expedition to Jerusalem as a solution for the issue.[378] In general, Robert seems to have been cautious about reproaching the knights, seeking to understand them instead. In one place,

---

[375] "Vos accincti cingulo militiae, magno superbitis supercilio; fratres vestros laniatis, atque inter vos dissecamini. Non est haec militia Christi, quae discerpit ovile Redemptoris. Sancta Ecclesia ad suorum opitulationem sibi reservavit militiam, sed vos eam male depravatis in malitiam. Ut veritatem fateamur, cujus praecones esse debemus, vere non tenetis viam per quam eatis ad vitam: vos pupillorum oppressores, vos viduarum praedones, vos homicidae, vos sacrilegi, vos alieni juris direptores: vos pro effundendo sanguine Christiano expectatis latrocinantium stipendia; et sicut vultures odorantur cadavera, sic longinquarum partium auspicamini et sectamini bella. Certe via ista pessima est, quoniam omnino a Deo remota est. Porro si vultis animabus vestris consuli, aut istiusmodi militiae cingulum quantocius deponite, aut Christi milites audacter procedite…" BB I.iv (14f–). Krey's translation somewhat altered.
[376] See also BB I.iii (12g), mistranslated in Ward 1985, 140. Compare with BB II.vii (38g–h), where Baldric employs similar expression (*vir ex militari cingulo*) in a different sense. Belt as the symbol of knighthood was related to the ceremony of dubbing into knighthood that developed probably in the late eleventh century. See Boulton 1995, 70 n. 104, 78; Kaeuper 2009, 14 n. 45. Belt as a symbol of order, however, was ancient, for it had been used since the Roman times. For this, see Le Jan 2007, 62. Against this, it is quite interesting that Guibert calls the mark of the cross as *cingulum militiae*. See GN II.v.271.
[377] FC I.i–iv; GN II.vii.
[378] RM I.i (728e–f).

however, he subtly frowns upon the knightly way of life – but elegantly and without breaking the narrative flow, weaving the message into the honeyed words of Bohemond of Taranto:

> What an order of soldiers, three and four times blessed! Until now you were stained with the blood of homicide; now you are crowned with heavenly laurels like the martyrs through sweat of the saints. Until now you have stood out as an incitement of God's anger; but now you are the reconciliation of his grace and the rampart of his faith.[379]

These allusions to problematic violence are closely related to the idea of *pax Dei*, which was more directly discussed by Fulcher in his version.[380] The peace movement was intended to be a solution for the internal warfare in the Christendom. It did attain wide popular support but was not very successful in its actual aims of restraining the violence. One reason for this might have been that the warfare constituted the way of life for the most powerful classes.[381] The endemic violence originated from the feudal system of post-Carolingian era, which engendered diffusion in political and military power. Consequently, continuous power struggles prevailed between the numerous territorial princes, sovereign in their own lands, and among their vassals. These contests could not be brought to an end simply by labelling the claims or means of one side invalid or immoral, for quite often there was no single authority that could have enforced the peace. Thus it was not until the kings had gained significantly more power that the Peace became more efficient in practice.[382]

---

[379] "O ordo militum, nunc terque quaterque beatus! Qui huc usque fuisti homicidii sanguine deturpatus, nunc sanctorum sudoribus compar martyrum coelesti es diademate laureatus. Huc usque exstisti incitamentum irae Dei; nunc vero reconciliatio gratiae ipsius, et propugnaculum fidei suae." RM II.xvi (748a–b). Sweetenham's translation.

[380] See Chapter 3.1 above.

[381] Bloch 1962, 289–299, 408–410.

[382] For the socio-political conditions, see Hallam 1980, 13–20; Bloch 1962, 289–299, 408–412. For the Peace, see Head & Landes 1992 (ed.); Cowdrey 1970, 42–67; Bloch 1962, 412–420. Some scholars have regarded the peace movement as a preliminary condition for the First Crusade, but others have strongly argued against this. See MacKinney 1930, 201–203; Erdmann 1977 (1935), 57–94; cf. Bull 1993, 56–69. Recently Tomaz Mastnak argued that "the injunctions of the Peace of God had deflected the aggressive forces harbored by Christian society away from Christendom…" and that "Under Urban II's pontificate, the idea of diverting war among Christians to war against non-Christians materialized in…a form that was to become institutionalized." See Mastnak 2002, 50. Marcus Bull, on the other hand, wrote: "Quite probably Urban and other senior clergy were alive to the possibility that Latin Europe might be pacified somewhat by the diversion of some arms-bearers' energies abroad; but this could have been nothing more than an incidental strategic aim. The crusade was no 'war on war', nor did it represent a deliberate conceptual ply by ecclesiastics attempting to pursue the Peace of God programme by other means." See Bull 1993, 284. See Also Cowdrey 1970, 56: "There can be little doubt that in the genesis of the First Crusade, such institutions as the holy war and pilgrimage counted for more than did the Peace of God. But Urban's preaching found its overwhelming response in the south of France, where the original Peace of God had accustomed men to hear the preaching of the renewal of Christian life."

Nevertheless, the concern for endemic violence was not only an ecclesiastic burden; for the distress was shared also by many in the laity, including the belligerent part of it. There are enough evidence (especially in charters) to assert that many knights were quite anxious for their souls and the prospects for their salvation.[383] This trepidation is also discussed in Guibert's narrative. Like Baldric, he wrote that the pope denounced the wrongful secular war, which was driven merely by greed and pride. Then, in the same breath, the pope declaimed that the rewards for this kind of warfare were "eternal death and damnation".[384] As an alternative, he presented the warfare which offered the "gift of glorious martyrdom".[385] In his first book, Guibert wrote that the "pious purpose" of fighting against the "barbarians" and defending the Church was not in the minds of everyone. Therefore, God instituted the "holy wars" in his times – "so that the knightly order and the erring mob…might find a new way of earning salvation".[386] The novelty was not the sacrality of fighting as such, for that had already been sustained for centuries. It was the new spiritual reward that was revolutionary.[387] Hence, Guibert did not speak of *bella sacra* but *prelia sancta* – the expedition was a spiritual contest which outshone even the wars of the Maccabees.[388]

In personal level, this new kind of war was penitentiary in nature. It required true repentance and confession of the participants. In return for penance, the crusader received remission for his sins.[389] Robert put this quite precisely in asserting that the crusaders were "reborn through confession and penitence".[390] What, indeed, would have been a better way to purge the sins than reverting to the apostolic model of living (*via apostolica*) initiated by Christ? The crusaders truly saw themselves as imitating Christ

---

[383] Bull 1993, 69, 280, et passim; Riley-Smith 1997, 69–70. More generally, see Kaeuper 2009, 17–32.
[384] "Indebita hactenus bella gessistis, in mutuas cedes vesana aliquotiens tela solius cupiditatis ac superbiae causa torsistis, ex quo perpetuos interitus et certa dampnationis exitia meruistis..." GN II.iv.163–166.
[385] "...nunc vobis bella proponimus, quae in se habent gloriosum martirii munus, quibus restat presentis et aeternae laudis titulus." GN II.iv166–168.
[386] "At quoniam in omnium animis haec pia desivit intentio…instituit nostro tempore prelia sancta deus, ut ordo equestris et vulgus oberrans…novum repperirent salutis promerendae genus…" GN I.i.64–69. Levine's translation.
[387] On the development of spiritually meritorious warfare before the First Crusade, see Erdmann 1977; Robinson 1973, 169–192; and, especially after the First Crusade, Kaeuper 2009.
[388] For example, GN II.iv.156, VI.206. On the comparison between the biblical wars and the crusade, see also I.i and VII.xxii.
[389] The crusade indulgence does not fit well into the later doctrine which evolved during the twelfth century. This has led some historians to suggest that the original indulgence was misunderstood as a plenary remission for guilt (*culpa*) and the punishment (*poena*) alike, although that this would not have been the papal intention. For this, see Mayer 1988 (1965), 33–36. Bull and Riley-Smith have quite appositely noted that the crusade indulgence belonged to an earlier tradition in which this kind of separation was not done. Thus the crusaders believed, as was intended, that crusading remitted sins. See Bull 1993, 166–171; Riley-Smith 1986, 27–29.
[390] "Nunc iterum secundo regenerati estis, per confessionem scilicet et poenitentiam, quam quotidie duris laboribus exhibetis." RM II.xvi (747e–748a).

(*imitatio Christi*), empathising his pain and his sufferings, wandering to venerate his holy tomb.[391] This was because the idea of crusading rested greatly upon the older tradition of pilgrimage.[392] In all the narratives, the crusaders are called *peregrini*, ("pilgrims") or *pauperes Christi* ("the poor of Christ"), of which the latter alludes to the humble and austere nature of the penance.[393] In addition, the expedition in general was almost entirely designated with the expressions that normally referred to pilgrimage.[394] Hence, it was not about the similarities or slightly resembling features; in the contemporary perspective, crusading truly *was* pilgrimage.[395] Yet, it was very special kind of a pilgrimage – one that was fused with the tradition of holy war.[396]

Now, one might wonder how an armed warrior could possibly cleanse his sins by imitating a pacifist who did not strike but turned his other cheek instead and at the same time slaughter "the infidels". For some, this was an insurmountable contradiction indeed.[397] Yet it was not this stoic attitude of Christ that was relevant. Instead, his inequitable suffering and ultimately the demise on the cross was believed to have conquered the death of humankind through the redemption of their sins. This altruistic act was seen as a mystery and, at the same time, the key for salvation. Therefore, a pilgrim was supposed to imitate Christ in his sufferings and to follow his wandering way of life. Through this penance, he was able to receive absolution for his sins.[398] It was because of this tradition that *imitatio Christi* was possible for the crusaders.

Parallels between crusading and the Passion of Christ can be seen in various levels in the narratives. The crusaders suffered physically and spiritually; their faith was tested in various tribulations, and fundamentally they did this all to help their brothers in

---

[391] Purkis 2008, 30–47.
[392] On pilgrimage in general, see Sumption 1975.
[393] This feature is more stressed in the *Gesta* than in the Benedictine narratives, see GF iv (11), ix (18), xxxix (96), just to name few examples. However, also the Benedictines used this terminology, see for example RM II.xvi (747d–e): "O bellatores Dei et indeficientes peregrini Sancti Sepulcri…"; BB I.vi (16e); BB I.xvi (22g): "Peregrini pro Deo sumus; Christi milites sumus…" Guibert seems to not favour this term, as he uses it only once in referance to the crusaders (it is notable that this is in context of suffering): "Urebant animos remote adeo peregrinantium pignorum affectus, delectationes uxoriae, possessionum fastigia, et tamen, acsi ibidem permansuri perpetuo, non desistebant a Christi prosequenda militia." GN VII.v.240–244. The word *peregrinans* can also be translated as 'he who travels'. But Guibert is unequivocal in that the crusade was a kind of pilgrimage. Nevertheless, it was not an ordinary one. See for example GN III.i.12–14: "At ille interrogat an arma deferant, utrum peras an aliqua huius novae peregrinationis insignia preferant…"
[394] *Via Dei/Christi/Domini*, *via/iter Sancti Sepulchri*, or simply *peregrinatio*. See for example GF i (1–2); RM I.ii (729g), iii (730b–c); BB I.iv (16); GN VII.xxix.
[395] For the crusade as pilgrimage, see Mayer 1988 13–15, 26–29; Riley-Smith 1986, 22–24; Purkis 2008, 30–58.
[396] For the tradition of holy war and its relation to the just war, see Kangas 2007, 55–62; Cowdrey 2003, 175–192; Erdmann 1977; and Robinson 1973, 184–190.
[397] Kaeuper 2009, 9–17.
[398] Originally, absolution was given only after penitential performance, but since the end of tenth century it was usually granted immediately after confession. See Sumption 1975, 100.

faith (whether eastern Christians or western pilgrims). Already in the *Gesta Francorum*, the decisive moment of the siege of Jerusalem is narrated to take place on Friday, at the very hour when "our Lord Jesus Christ deigned to suffer for us upon the cross".[399] The Benedictines clearly approved with this interpretation.[400] Robert even reverts to the symbolism later in the context of the battle of Ascalon.[401] In addition, all the authors emphasise the tribulations of the journey in order to manifest that the journey was truly penitential in nature.[402] In short, it seems that the theme of pilgrimage is almost identical in content regardless of the narrative.

The fusion of pilgrim and warrior was nevertheless a novelty. Thus it is no wonder that the authors present slightly conflicting and even confused views of it. For example, in most of the sources, the call for crusade was universal and free for anyone – completely in keeping with the tradition of pilgrimage, yet inconsistent with both the military nature of the expedition and the promoted image of warrior-pilgrim.[403] In this context, it is interesting that in Robert's version the pope announced that only those who could fight were eligible to depart. Moreover, no one was to set forth without an approval of his spiritual supervisor.[404]

Similarly, some aspects of the spiritual reward seem to have developed during the journey. It is not certain that the pope had announced martyrdom for those who deceased on the journey. Nonetheless, the participants who believed that they were leading a morally pure way of life and being on a divine mission apparently regarded their dead as martyrs. This interpretation became confirmed by their visions of divine army, consisting of saints and martyrs.[405] After all, it had been already for centuries an established doctrine that those who passively accepted death because of their faith would merit the crown of martyrdom and immediately received an everlasting life. Moreover, already since the ninth century, the popes had declared martyrs those who had died in a battle for the Church – or "justice", as Pope Leo IX put it. Nevertheless,

---

[399] "…hora scilicet in qua Dominus noster Iesus Christus dignatus est pro nobis sufferre patibulum crucis…" GF xxxviii (90–91). Hill's translation.
[400] GN VII.vi.310; BB IV.xiv (102b); RM IX.vii (867b).
[401] RM IX.xvi (874a–b), IX.xx (876). Compare to GF xxxix (95), where it is merely noted that it was Friday again.
[402] For example, GF i (2), xv (34), xxvi (62–63); GN IV.vi, ix.431–449; RM IV.x, V.xiv; BB II.xii (44), III.xi.
[403] In theory, pilgrimage was prohibited for the ecclesiastics because they were already on the journey to the Heavenly Jerusalem; an additional journey was therefore deemed both unnecessary and superficial – the permanent conversion was superior to the temporary spiritual exercise. This idea, however, does not mean that the churchmen would not in practice have participated in pilgimages, quite the opposite. See Purkis 2008, 14 and n. 16.
[404] RM I.ii (729d–g).
[405] Riley-Smith 1986, 114–119. For the intervention of divine army, see GF xxix (69); cf. RM V.viii, VII.xiii; BB III.xvii; GN VI.ix.

the interpretation according to which those who died while actively participating in the holy mission were martyrs became generally accepted only after the success of the expedition confirmed the divine nature of this mission.[406] The uncertainty about the exact theological sense is suggested by Baldric's ambiguous attitude towards the passages on martyrdom. In numerous instances he either obscured or omitted the original references to martyrdom.[407] On other passages, however, he clearly approves this interpretation.[408] It is not clear whether he held to a somewhat stricter definition of martyrdom than the other authors, but he clearly believed that everyone who took part in the journey deserved a spiritual reward.[409] His hesitance to label the casualties as martyrs may still point to the novelty of the rewarding system.[410]

Real differencies between the anonymous narrative and the Benedictine versions become apparent when we examine the exact nature of the warrior image. Already in *Gesta Francorum*, crusaders are referred to as the "soldiers of Christ" (*milites Christi*).[411] They were pious warriors, protected by faith and signs of the Cross which they faithfully bore every day.[412] In preparation for battle, the army advanced in procession, praying, giving alms, and fasting.[413] They also called upon the name of Christ while engaging the enemy.[414] After victory, they praised the Lord for the success and were overjoyed for fulfilling their vows to him.[415] These all were rather

[406] Morris 1993, 93–104; Riley-Smith 1997, 48; Erdmann 1977, 27–28.
[407] BB I.x (20a), II.xvi (49h), III.v (93g); cf RM III.xv (763–764b); GN IV.xiv.667–670. For a more straightforward interpretation, according to which the Benedictines put the "unformed" and "crude" notion of the eyewitness accounts on "firm theological foundations", see Riley-Smith 1986, 151.
[408] "Mortui sunt ibi multi Christiani, alii fame, alii gladio, alii quolibet exterminio. Hos autem omnes existimant felici laureatos martyrio, quoniam pro fratrum compassione sua corpora tradiderunt." BB I.xxvii (30f–g).
[409] "Facultates etiam inimicorum vestrae erunt: quoniam et vel victoriosi ad propria remeabitis, vel sanguine vestro purpurati, perenne bravium adipiscemini. Tali imperatori militare debetis, cui omnis non deest potentia, cui quae rependat nulla desunt stipendia. Via brevis est, labor premodicus est qui tamen *immarcescibilem* vobis rependet *coronam*." BB I.iv (15d); I Petri 5:4.
[410] This discrepancy of interpretations has gone unnoticed for example in Riley-Smith 1986, 151; and Packard 2011, 46. Riley-Smith 1986, 116, nevertheless notes that "It is hard to avoid concluding that in 1095 the classification of warriors in the same category as those gentle souls who passively accepted violence perpetrated against themselves was not yet universally acceptable."
[411] See for example GF ix (18), xxix (70). The title *miles Christi* was traditionally used of ecclesiastics fighting against the invisible demons of soul. See Erdmann 1977, 12–14, 201–202; Robinson 1973, 177–178. It has been suggested, and widely accepted, that the ideal of *miles Christi* was based on the earlier tradition of *fideles*/*miles sancti Petri*, which was created by Pope Gregory VII. On this see Robinson 1973, 176–192; Erdmann 1977, 201–228. Yet, as Riley-Smith 1986, 8, has argued, the formerly promoted ideal comprised only the meritorious battle in support of the papacy; it was not a spiritual penance which purged of sins. Moreover, Bull 2008, 45, has aptly questioned the importance of the earlier ideal, as not many laymen had embraced it. In summary, there undoubtly was a precedent for *miles Christi*, but it is not evident what was the importance of it.
[412] GF xiii (31), xviii (40).
[413] GF xxxviii (90).
[414] GF xviii (40), xxix (70), xxxvii (89).
[415] GF xxix (70), xxxviii (92).

conventional attributes of a pious army, with which the Benedictines did not disagree. Nevertheless, they enhanced and stressed some features of this image.

First of all, the Benedictines emphasised that the knight of Christ should place his trust entirely on God – not his own strength or equipment. It was only because of God's will that battles were won. Therefore, also the glory belonged ultimately to him, and not to the knightly skills.[416] Baldric writes that during a great famine the crusaders sang the Psalm: *Not to us, O lord, not to us; but to thy name give glory*.[417] In the eyes of the Benedictines, the crusade was a divine act, in which the crusaders were mere instruments of God.[418] Because of this, the knight of Christ could be completely fearless before the death. According to Robert, the leaders of the army announced to the Muslim ambassadors that

> No human strength can inspire us with terror because when we die we are born; when we lose our earthly lives we gain eternal life. So go and tell those who sent you that we will not lay down the arms we took up at home until we have captured Jerusalem. We place our trust in Him who *teacheth* our *hands to war, so that thou* make our *arms like a brazen bow*; the road will be opened by our swords, all wrongdoing will be eradicated and Jerusalem captured. It will be ours, not by virtue of human toleration, but through the justice of divine decree. It is by God's countenance that Jerusalem will be judged ours.[419]

In addition to the spiritual rewards and the protection from damnation, all temporal needs were looked after as well: spoils, essential for the maintenance of the army, were divinely supplied when necessary.[420] And, whenever the army encountered difficulties, this was due to two possible reasons: the impediment was either a punishment for sins or an ordeal of faith.[421]

---

[416] For example, GN III.viii.406–430, 440–443; RM II.xvi (748b).
[417] "*Non nobis, Domine, non nobis: sed nomini tuo da gloriam.*" BB III.xi (71b); Psalmi 113:9.
[418] GN VII.ix.415–418: "Sepulchrum ergo dominicum adeunt et de quesita beatorum locorum libertate Illi summopere gratulantur, qui tanta per eos exercuerat, quanta nec ab ipsis, per quos acta sunt, neque ab ullo hominum poterant estimari."; BB IV.vii (95d): "…evidenter inter eos Deus conversatus est, et per eos bella sua bellatus est"; BB IV.iii (91f): "Deus etenim sic operabatur in illis…"; RM, prologus (723): "Hoc enim non fuit humanum opus, sed divinum."; and RM V.ii (792d), "Et notum esse poterit his qui ignorant, quia non est hominum evertere regna, sed ejus per quem reges regnant."; cf. Proverbia 8:15.
[419] "Nulla virtus est humana quae nobis omnino terrorem incutiat: quia quum morimur nascimur, quum vitam amittimus temporalem, recuperamus sempiternam. Idcirco renuntiate his qui miserunt vos, quia arma quae in patria nostra sumpsimus, etiam quum capta erit Iherusalem, non dimittemus. Confidimus enim in eo *qui docet manus* nostras *ad praelium*, et *brachia* nostra ponit *ut arcum aereum*; quoniam et via nostris gladiis aperietur, et omnia scandala eradicabuntur, et Iherusalem capietur. Tunc nostra erit, non per hominis indulgentiam, sed per coelestis censurae aequitatem. De vultu enim Domini hoc judicum prodiit, quia Iherusalem nostra erit." RM V.ii (792e–f); Psalmi 17:35.
[420] This aspect is already in the *Gesta*. Guibert and Robert lay stress on it. Baldric, on the other hand, does not underline it. See for example, GN II.xvii.743–763, IV.iv.247–248, VI.ix; RM IV.vi (778b), viii; cf. BB I.xxii (26d), II.ii (35b–c); GF ix (19–20), xvii (37).
[421] GN IV.vii.353–359; RM IV.x; BB III.xi (70h–71b).

Besides the emphasis on faith and the subordination to God, the Benedictines apparently projected some of their monastic values in their narratives. In particular, they all dwell on the passages where it was possible to discuss the virtues of self-discipline, humility, and temperance. This is evident for example in the Benedictine descriptions of plundering. In most passages, the loot is explained as a divine provision. In some places, however, the authors clearly stress that the ideal crusader was more interested in his mission and the spiritual merit of it than plundering. For example, in the context of the battle of Antioch, the Anonymous writes that they pursued the fleeing enemy, for "the knights of Christ were more eager to chase them than to look for any plunder".[422] Robert turned this passage into a fully developed laudation:

> Amazing is the strength of Omnipotent God, and his power is boundless! Your soldier, weakened by long starvation, pursues enemies bulging with fat and flab so assiduously that they do not even dare to look back at the possessions they brought with them. Your benevolent spirit was in their minds, bolstering their physical strength and strengthening their resolve. Your soldier is not held back by the desire for plunder or avarice for any possession; for victory above all fills his mind.[423]

The point was probably the same in both versions: that the ideal knight did not plunder before the battle was over because communal success came before individual desires. The difference is that the short passage of the anonymous version does not implicate the reasons for such behaviour, whilst Robert makes the explanation unambiguous. Guibert and Baldric repeated the passage but did not elaborate the theme here.[424] Nonetheless, they emphasised the ideal of self-restraint in different parts of the narrative. One example is particularly illustrative. The Anonymous writes that, during the siege of Antioch the leaders wanted to fortify a certain castle in a strategic location. According to the Anonymous, they held a council in which Tancred, one of Bohemond's followers, stood up and promised to hold the fortification and to block all the hostile traffic in the area. Of his efforts, Tancred asked a reward, which was granted "at once". Then he "took no delay" but hastened to defend the castle.[425] The story is narrated completely

[422] "Itaque milites Christi magis amabant persequi illos, quam ulla spolia quaerere." GF xxix (70). Hill's translation.
[423] "O mira virtus Dei omnipotentis, et immensa potestas! Miles tuus, longo afflictus jejunio, persequitur tumentes adipe et pinguedine, ita ut etiam nec ad sua bona, quae attulerant, auderent respicere. Spiritus tuus bonus erat in mentibus eorum, qui et vires suggerebat corporum, et audaciam praestabat animorum. Non illum retardat ulla cupiditas spoliorum, nulla ullius rei avaritia: quoniam illius mentem magis titillat victoria." RM VII.xiv (833b–c). Sweetenham's translation.
[424] GN VI.ix.230–236; BB III.xvii (78c–d).
[425] GF xix (43).

without reproof, portraying Tancred as acting bravely. But for the monastic mind, this passage might have been disturbing because Tancred did not act solely from his devotion but out of personal gain. Baldric writes that, only after all the other leaders had refused the task because they were "afraid" of it, they talked to Tancred and "appointed" him to defend the castle. He also omits any mention of payment.[426] Thus the example is revised from being a dubious transaction into a conduct of self-sacrifice.

Guibert resolved the issue differently. Instead of leaving out the disturbing material and altering the narrative, he decided to comment on the passage. He left the story untouched. Yet, before Tancred's promise and his request, Guibert writes that, although Tancred was admittedly perceptive in war, now he was "unable to restrain himself" and "immediately broke in", giving then his promise with the pleading for compensation. According to Guibert, the promised payment "did not match the magnitude of the task". However, Tancred could not but accept it because otherwise he might have been considered "lazy".[427] Then, closely following the material of the anonymous narrative, Guibert recounts that Tancred succeeded in confiscating the supplies of the enemy. The story had now become edificative. Guibert writes that

> The good man could no longer complain that while he was carrying out such a holy task God was forgetful of him, but he had learned, for the first time, from this remarkable good fortune that he would never again lack bodily necessities, and that he would not lack eternal reward from God, after his earthly assistance.[428]

What was originally a disturbing incident of pecuniary reward had thus been transformed into a moral of humility, restrain, and God's providence. Because of his lack of self-restraint, Tancred was caught up in a dangerous task in order to gain a meagre profit. However, he was pardoned and rewarded by God, for the task was nevertheless helpful for the holy mission. Tancred now knew that he did not have to worry about the "bodily necessities" because God would provide them. The inclination for concentrating on temporal interests was futile, and so were the sinful vices deriving from it.

Another virtue of interest in the narratives is that of chastity. Robert made no comment on the subject, but for Baldric and Guibert this was an important theme.

---

[426] BB II.xviii (52a–d).
[427] GN IV.xiv.754–.
[428] "Nec iam vir bonus conqueri potuit, cum tam pio exerceretur negotio, divinitus sese oblitum, sed in hac quam primum fortuna edidicit quod neque umquam nimie corporalibus indigeret et deinde fructus aeternitatis post ipsa carnis subsidia sibi non deesset ad deum." GN IV.xiv.789–794.

Guibert praised that during the siege of Antioch "the Christian law" prevailed and that every crime was punished justly. According to him, particular attention was given to sexual crimes. He writes that, fortunately, the spirit of God and the fear of death protected men from lust, so that "merely speaking of a prostitute or of a brothel was considered intolerable".[429] In similar manner, Baldric wrote that the brothel and the prostitutes were cast off from the camp during the siege of Nicaea, adding that where women dwelt with men they did so in proper wedlock.[430] In the monastic model of life, chastity was regarded as the ideal way of living, although it most likely had nothing to do with the reality of campaigning.[431] An implication of this can be seen in one passage of the *Gesta*, where the author relates a story about a revelation of Christ to a certain priest.[432] In this vision, the priest begs Jesus to help the crusaders in their difficult situation. Jesus responds fiercely that he had already given the assistance but still the crusaders were performing their "filthy deeds of pleasure with Christian and filthy pagan women, so that a great stench goes up to heaven".[433] Here all the Benedictines followed their source very carefully, obviously agreeing with the original version and believing in the authenticity of the vision.[434] Thus, not even in their idealised versions was chastity always followed.

Another weighty theme for Baldric and Guibert was equality, which was an important element in Benedictine monasticism.[435] Right before the aforementioned passage on chastity, Baldric describes his ideal of the crusader army:

> In that expedition dukes themselves were fighting, and the dukes themselves were keeping watch, so that one could not tell a duke from a knight or a knight from a duke. Moreover, so many things were held by the commonalty that

[429] "Unde fiebat ut ibi nex mentio scorti nec nomen prostibuli toleraretur haberi, presertim cum pro hoc ipso scelere gladiis gentilium, deo iudice, verentur addici." GN IV.xv.807–810. Levine's translation.
[430] "Lupanar et prostibulum omnino a castris suis procul eliminaverant, et potissimum de morum honestate disceptabant; ibi tamen cum hominibus mulieres cohabitabant, sed vel in conjugio vel in legali ministerio." BB I.xxiv (28f–g).
[431] For the pursue of chastity in monastic thought, see Holt 2008, 449–470; Murray 2004, 24–42; Elliott 1997, 1–23; Brundage 1987, 59–87.
[432] GF xxiii (57–59). This story was apparently considered truthful, for it was repeated very accurately in most of the narratives of the First Crusade.
[433] "Ecce in auxilio oportuno, misi uos sanos et incolumes in ciuitatem, et ecce multam prauamque dilectionem operantes cum Christianis et prauis paganis mulieribus, unde immensus foetor ascendit in caelum." GF xxiii (58). [mod]
[434] RM VII.i (821–822); BB III.vii–viii (65–67); GN V.xvii–xviii. This scrupulous attitude is present in their reiteration of another vision of the anonymous narrative. The latter vision led to the discovery of Longinus, i.e. the spear that had supposedly pierced the side of Jesus. See RM VII.ii–iii (822–823); BB III.ix, xiv (67–68, 73–74); GN V.xix, VI.i; compare to GF xxv, xxvii (59–60, 65). In the latter case, Robert simplifies the narrative sequence. The content, however, is the same in all the versions. In comparison, Fulcher and Raymond provide fairly different depictions of these events. See FC I.xviii.1–3; RA x–xi (253–259).
[435] Lawrence 1989, 26–39.

> scarcely anyone could say that anything was his own; in fact, just as in the primitive Church, nearly *all things were held in common*.[436]

Indeed, it was believed that in the primitive Church, Christians had led a communal way of life without any personal property which could hamper one's concentration on the spiritual.[437] The ideal was based on the equality between "brothers"; no one was deemed more valuable than the other. Especially the ecclesiastical reformers were keen to promote this ideal.[438] Against this, it is worth noticing that in Robert's narrative one cannot found such an emphasis. Robert gives some merit to the "footmen" for their military utility, but otherwise he focuses merely on the deeds of distinctive characters.[439] Although in many occasions he stresses the unity of the army there is no ideal of equality or commonality in his narrative.[440] Guibert, on the other hand, is more ambiguous in this respect. He argues that a good leader leads by personal example.[441] In some passages he also openly exalts the ordinary rank and file (*pedestris populositatem turbae*).[442] Mostly, however, he is distinctively elitist in his discussion. For instance, he dedicates many pages for the descriptions of genealogies and achievements of the most important leaders on the expedition.[443] He is also much concerned about the harsh conditions of those "who remembered their high social position in their native land, where they had been accustomed to great ease and pleasure". Now they had to content themselves with barley bread: "How many jaws and throats of noble men were eaten away by the roughness of this bread."[444] In spite of this, Guibert seems to have shared

---

[436] "In ista siquidem expeditione duces ipsi militabant, ipsi duces excubabant: ut nescires quid dux a milite, quid miles differret a duce. Praeterea tanta erat ibi rerum omnium communitas, ut vix aliquis aliquid sibi diceret proprium; sed sicut in primitiva ecclesia, ferme *illis erant omnia communia*." BB I.xxiv (28f); Actus Apostolorum 4:32. Translation modified from Purkis 2008, 48–49, and Riley-Smith 1987, 150.

[437] Lawrence 1989, 28–29.

[438] Purkis 2008, 47.

[439] "Sciunt enim quibus bella nota sunt quia graviori attritione pedites quam equites interficiunt." RM IV.vii (778e).

[440] Note, however, that Purkis 2008, 49, as well as Riley-Smith 1986, 150, have taken the term *sacra fidelium Dei societas* as manifesting the communal nature of the expedition. To me, this seems too flimsy a piece of evidence. For the passage where this term is used, see RM IV.xii (781d).

[441] "...sciebant namque piae naturae instinctu, etsi non legerant, quod Marius ille secundum Salustium ait: 'Si tute', inquit, 'molliter agas, exercitum autem imperio cogas, hoc est dominum, non imperatorem esse'." GN IV.iii.187–190.

[442] GN III.vii.325–.

[443] GN II.xii–III.ii, VII.xii–xiii.

[444] "Quanta tot virorum nobilium fauces et guttura cibarii panis illius rodebantur aspredine, quanta delicatos eorum stomachos putidorum laticum putamus tortos acredine! Bone deus, quid patientiarum inibi fuisse pensamus, ubi non immemores erant quique habitae quondam in patria dignitatis, quam condire fuerat solita non exiguae requies voluptatis, cum ea quae patiebantur nullius exterioris lenirent aut spes aut solatia questus eosque in dies crudelissimorum laborum decoqueret estus! Haec mea est sententia, haec unica, numquam a seculorum tales extitisse principiis, qui pro sola expectatione emolumenti spiritualis tot corpora sua exposuere suppliciis." GN VII.v.229–240. Levine's translation.

the same profound ideal of equality as Baldric. At the end part of his chronicle, he writes in conclusion that during the journey "both the lowly and the great learned to carry the yoke, so that the servant did not serve a master, nor did the lord claim anything more than brotherhood from the servant".[445] At another place he also writes that "there you would have seen the greatest princes labouring at carrying rocks".[446]

All the Benedictines emphasised that it was the renouncement of temporal world that was vital for the crusader. Like a monk, the crusader renounced the temporal world and dedicated himself to the spiritual journey. This he did purely in pious motivation and entirely of his own volition – although clearly guided by the Holy Spirit. According to Baldric, Urban preached to knights that they should not let the "seductive charm of women" or their property to keep them from going.[447] In other words, they had to temporarily abandon all the secular matters. Robert writes that the crusaders had renounced not only their families, but also "all fleshly pleasures".[448] Thus, the Benedictines required a certain change in the way of living of the participants. Most prominent this theme of renouncement is in Guibert's narrative:

> The most splendid offices and the ownership of castles and towns meant nothing to them; the most beautiful wives became as loathsome as something putrid; pledges of domestic love [i.e. children], once more precious than any gem, were scorned. What no mortal could have compelled them to do by force, or persuaded them by rhetoric, they were carried forward by the sudden insistence of their transformed minds.[449]

As we have seen, there are passages in all three Benedictine versions that seem to project onto the story certain virtues which were fundamentally monastic: temperance, chastity, humility, and equality. Considering these, Riley-Smith has argued that the three Benedictines represented the crusading army as "a monastery in motion".[450] Moreover, when we remember that all the rewriters made a strong emphasis on the discipline and the unanimity of the crusaders, the simile seems not too far-fetched. Yet, one should ask

---

[445] "…parvus et magnus par addiscerent portare iugum, ut non respectaret servus ad dominum nec dominus nisi fraternitatem usurparet in famulum…" GN VII.xxiii.1212–1214. Levine's translation.
[446] "...precipue illic videres in lapidum comportatione primorum manus elaborare principum." GN IV.iii.182–183. Levine's translation.
[447] "Non vos demulceant illecebrosa blandimenta mulierum nec rerum vestrarum, quin eatis…" BB I.iv (15e).
[448] "Cognatos et affines, conjuges et liberos abdicastis, immo et omni corporeae voluptati renuntiastis." RM II.xvi (747e).
[449] "Honores amplissimi, castellorum et urbium dominia spernebantur, uxores pulcherrimae quasi quiddam tabidum vilescebant, omni gemma quondam gratiores promiscui sexus pignorum fastidiebantur aspectus, et ad quod mortalium nullus aut urgere imperio potuisset aut suasione propellere, ad id subita mentium demutatarum obstinatione ferebantur." GN I.i.79–84. See also GN II.xv.713, III.viii, VII.1–22.
[450] Riley-Smith 1986, 150–152.

whether this was an image of monastery or that of pilgrimage? The predominant ideal of apostolic way of living (*vita apostolica*) defined both of these institutions: both the monk and the pilgrim were supposed to lead a modest and poor life in imitation of Christ and his followers, both were to live communally and to treat each other as equals, and both were on a spiritual journey against the sins of mundane life. Hence, both the monk and the pilgrim aspired to imitate the Christ in his sufferings so that they could be purged from sin.[451] In this spiritual struggle, the monks were often entitled as *milites Christi*.[452] But, now the metaphor had become literal: the warriors were literally knights who fought the "twofold" battle against their sins and the Gentiles alike. In order to evaluate the meaning of all this, we should briefly examine the later development of this ideal.

A couple of decades after the Benedictine chronicles of the First Crusade, Bernard of Clairvaux, the foremost promulgator and cultivator of later ecclesiastic ideals of holy warrior, propagated the recently established Order of the Temple in his letter to Grandmaster Hugues de Payens.[453] As typical for the time, Bernard's letter was more like a public tract than a personal message. He proclaimed that a "new kind of knighthood" had risen in the Orient.[454] According to Bernard, the Templars were God's agents for punishing the malefactors. They wore "an armour of faith" as well as that of steel.[455] Consequently, they were fearless in battle, as they did not need to be afraid of death or sin. In contrast to this new warrior, Bernard reproached the secular knighthood which was driven by pride, vanity, greed, and anger.[456] It is striking that, considering the secular knighthood, Bernard used similar wordplay as Baldric: *non…militiae, sed malitiae*, he wrote ("not…soldiery, but malice").[457] Whereas Baldric summarised his message in the words: *militiam…depravatis in malitiam* ("you have depraved soldiery into malice"). Moreover, like the crusaders according to Guibert and Robert, they as well waged "the twofold battle against flesh and blood as well as the spiritual evils in the heavens".[458]

---

[451] Sumption 1975, 87–97; Lawrence 1989, 28.
[452] Erdmann 1977, 12–14; Robinson 1973, 177–178; Lawrence 1989, 26.
[453] Bernard of Clairvaux. "Liber ad milites templi de laude novae militiae" – *Sancti Bernardi opera vol. 3. Tractatus et opuscula*. pp. 205–239. [Henceforth "BC"] For dating and context, see Upton-Ward 1992, 4–5; Barber 1994, 44. On Templars in general, see Barber 1994; and Lawrence 1989, 206–215.
[454] "Novum militiae genus ortum nuper auditur in terris, et in illa regione, quam olim in carne praesens visitavit Orins ex alto…" BC, p. 214, lines 1–2.
[455] BC 214.16–17.
[456] BC 216.
[457] BC 216.1–2.
[458] "Novum, inquam, militiae genus, et saeculis inexpertum, qua gemino pariter conflictu infatigabiliter decertatur, tum adversus carnem et sanguinem, tum contra spiritualia nequitiae in caelestibus." BC 214.7

According to Bernard, the Templars were disciplined and obedient before their master, which they followed in one heart and spirit.[459] They did not have personal possessions, but instead everyone lived chastely and communally together. One was supposed to embrace the virtues of temperance and patience. The ideal brother was required to aid his comrades, for everyone was considered equal. He was content in his position, and industrious in everything he undertook. In short, the ideal was that of a monastic community which lived according the *vita apostolica*.[460] In battle, these new kind of knights were interested only in victory, not glory. They were ordered and cautious, not reckless. Like "true Israelites", Bernard writes, "they go forth to war at peace…fling themselves against their foes and treat their adversaries like sheep…"[461] Accordingly, the Templars were "both gentler than lambs and fiercer than lions", so that Bernard was unable to decide whether they should be called monks or knights – thus, he concludes that they were both.[462]

As we see, Bernard was obviously acquainted with the earlier discourse on *miles Christi*. His ideal of the holy warrior is in great resemblance with that of the Benedictines. The main difference between the crusader and the Templar was that for the latter most of the demeanoural ideals were compulsory and defined by the rule, whereas for the crusaders the ideal was promoted by preachers and historians alike, thus being merely preferable at the most. Another difference was related to the duration. The crusader's journey was temporary, whereas the Templar was confined to the order for life. This is actually the fundamental difference between pilgrim and monk: the latter was basically a pilgrim who had permanently chosen to follow the *vita apostolica*. Furthermore, his journey was only spiritual, whereas pilgrims travelled both physically and spiritually.[463] Consequently, the terminology of pilgrimage is far more apposite considering the crusaders than that of monasticism. Indeed, the Benedictines did not claim that the crusader were monks – only that they lived like monks.

The Knights Templar, regulated by the written rule, based on the Cistercian

---

10.

[459] BC 219.22–220.10.

[460] BC 220.16–24.

[461] "Veri profecto Israelitae procedunt ad bella pacifici…hostes velut oves reputant, nequaquam, etsi paucissimi…" BC 221.5–9.

[462] "Ita denique miro quodam ac singulari modo cernuntur et agnis mitiores, et leonibus ferociores, ut pene dubitem quid potius censeam appellantdos, monachos videlicer an milites, nisi quod utrumque forsan congruentius nominarim, quibus neutrum deesse cognoscitur, nec monachi mansuetudo, nec militis fortitudo." BC 221.17–21. According to Brundage 2003, 152–156, this was also the problem of the military orders: that they were a hybrid of different kind of religious practices. Thus they were morally questionable and had no legal status.

[463] Sumption 1975, 95.

doctrine, was undoubtedly a monastic order. The Bernardine ideal of Templars was profoundly the same as the Benedictine ideal of crusader. Yet, not all the elements of this ideal were discussed by each of the Benedictines. Robert did not touch the subject of equality nor did he dwell on the ideal of chastity. This might reflect his intended audience, given that these features were in obvious conflict with the prevalent secular knightly ideas: valour, prestige, power, and *largesse* (generosity and the ability of showing one's wealth).[464] Moreover, it is only Guibert who explicitly compared the crusader to the monastic ideals. Contrasting the crusaders with the Jewish warriors of the Old Testament he claims that, unlike those Jews who served God "only for their own bellies" and for whom everything was provided easily, the crusaders lived in "continual and great need, leading the lives not of soldiers but of moderate and chaste monks".[465] Given that pilgrim and monk were two roles grounding on the same ideal, it is only logical that the crusader was supposed to live *like* a monk, for he was under a penitential pilgrimage. This, however, does not mean that he truly was a monk. After all, he was vowed only temporarily to the *vita apostolica*. Hence, it should be stressed that none of the Benedictines actually promoted an ideal of warrior monk. That association was left in the air. Nonetheless, for Bernard and the other founders of the *pauperes commilitones*, the step was not a quantum leap.

4.2 The Chosen People

> Because it was carried the yoke since the days of its youth, it will sit in isolation – a nation noble, wise, war-like, generous, brilliant above all kinds of nations. Every nation borrows the name as an honorific title; do we not see the Bretons, the English, the Ligurians call men "Frank" if they behave well?[466]

At this point of the study, we should question the most apparent definition of the crusaders as "Franks" in the sources (*Franci*/*Francigena*/*gens Francorum*).[467] This designation is slightly bewildering, for we know that the participants of the expedition

[464] On these, see Keen 2005, 1–43, 162–178.
[465] "…istis vero difficulter vincere, inter vincendum dampna frequentia, rarae opulentiae, continuae quidem et tunc crudelissimae egestates, cum hi non militarem sed monachilem, quantum ad parsimoniam sanctimoniamqua pertinet, vitam ducerent." GN VI.11–15. See also the tale of a certain knight Matthew, who received martyrdom in the expedition: GN IV.xviii; Riley-Smith 1986, 151–152.
[466] "Quia enim portavit iugum ab adolescentia sedebit solitaria, inter omnium videlicet gentium proprietates gens nobilis, prudens, bellicosa, dapsilis ac nitida. Quibus proprium cum sit nomen, quarumcumque nationum homines mutuato, immo prestito ipsorum agnomine honorantur: quos enim Britones, Anglos, Ligures, si bonis eos moribus videamus, non ilico Francos homines apellemus?" GN II.i.72–78; cf. Jeremias 15:17.
[467] For a thorough list of occurrences, see Bull 1997, 197 n. 6.

came from various locations, of which many were not part of the kingdom of France.[468] Furthermore, even the kingdom itself was a compound of various ethnic groups, cultures, and languages.[469] As we saw in Chapter 3.2, the Anonymous comments the division of the troops of Peter the Hermit saying that the *Lombardi*, *Langobardi*, and *Alamanni* broke away from the *Franci*.[470] The first two of these names denoted the people at northern Italy and the third roughly those who were located at the northern side of the Alps – but the latter term was also used more generally of those who were considered "the Germans". Here the Anonymous made a clear but uncommon distinction between the *Franci* and the other crusaders: the Italians and the Germans. Baldric followed this particular definition almost verbatim.[471] In another place, Baldric writes that, while the army was laying siege on the city of Nicaea, Robert of Normandy and Stephan of Blois arrived "with many princes, knights, and infantry – *Francigena*, *Normanni*, and *Britones* alike".[472] Thus he differentiated between the Normans, the Bretons (the residents of Brittany), and the Franks.[473] These rare examples suggest that in part the authors took these names as exclusive of each other. For the most part, however, all the crusaders were lumped together as *Franci*.[474] The question is what did the writers have in mind with this terminology? How was it possible – or by any means reasonable – to refer only a part of the crusaders and, at the same time, all of them with the same name?

The ambiguity of the term *Franci* has been issued to the development of the shared identities – a process that by the First Crusade had reached a point where there was different and overlapping meanings for the same term.[475] At the turn of the century, France was not yet the nation that it would later be. Originally the Frankish tribes came from a small area which is now located in the northwestern Germany. Under the Merovingian and Carolingian kings, they conquered much of the Western Europe. In

[468] Fulcher wrote: "sed quis unquam audivit tot tribus linguae in uno exercitu, cum ibi adessent Franci, Flandri, Frisi, Galli, Allobroges, Lotharingi, Alemanni, Baioarii, Normanni, Angli, Scoti, Aquitani, Itali, Daci, Apuli, Iberi, Britones, Graeci, Armeni? quod si vellet me aliquis Britannus vel Teutonicus interrogare, neutro respondere sapere possem." FC I.xiii.4. For an overview of the geographical origins of those crusaders that have been identified, see Riley-Smith 1997, maps 1 & 2. See also Bull 2008, 47.
[469] The most distinct division was of course that of northern and southern dialects – that of *langue d'oc* and *langue d'oil*. It reflected also ethnical differencies between the North and South. See Bull 1995, 209.
[470] "Tandem peruenerunt Nicomediam, ubi diuisi sunt Lombardi et Longobardi, et Alamanni a Francis…" GF ii (3).
[471] "Illic, Lumbardis, Longobardis et Alamannis a Francis separatis (Franci siquidem ferociores et intractabiliores erant, et ob id, ad mone malum procliviores)…" BB I.ix (18e).
[472] "Ecce advenerat comes Robertus de Normannia, et Stephanus Blesiensis comes, cum multis proceribus et militibus et peditibus tam Francigenis quam Normannis atque Britonibus." BB I.xxiii (27h).
[473] It should be noted however that this distinction is lacking in some manuscripts. In one of them there is an additional mention of "Rotgerius de Barna Villa et alii quamplures". See RHC Occ. vol. 4, p. 27 n. 22.
[474] Bull 1997, 196.
[475] Bull 1997, 195–211; Packard 2011, 62–66.

consequence of the power struggles during the reign of Charlemagne's son, Louis I, the Frankish Empire was divided into three separate kingdoms: west, east, and middle. Later, the first two of these developed into France and Germany, respectively. The middle kingdom, also known as "Lothrangia", disintegrated and was eventually subjugated by the eastern Franks.[476]

During the Frankish reign, the leading elite of the empire had created a shared identity of Frankishness that was based on the mythical past of the nation.[477] After the division of the empire, the former parts of it developed into different directions. The western *Francia* drew on the Carolingian heritage – even after the Carolingian dynasty had been deposed during the ninth and tenth century by the Robertians and Capetians. At the same time, the eastern kingdom had evolved into an empire under the Ottonian rulers. Of course, this was initially put forth as the reunion of the Frankish empire, but soon, as the western kingdom strove for its own ends, the promoters of the eastern empire begun to leap over the Frankish past and to exploit the earlier heritage – hence what was formerly called as the eastern *Francia* became to be known as the Holy Roman Empire.[478]

By the early twelfth century, both of these realms had generated dissimilar identities; while the empire found new ways to legitimate its presence, the western kingdom held on to its legacy as *Francia*. The ruler of the kingdom, however, was weak because he had to rely on relatively independent dukes and counts to support his position. The king was soveraign only in a relatively small area from north of Paris to south of Orléans. Consequently, the king as a person was quite often challenged, for he was hardly greater than the other lords. Yet king as an institution, which grounded upon the Carolingian past, was not. Evidently, the elite of the kingdom thought that they were supposed to be ruled by a king, that they were part of something bigger – that they shared an identity and thus formed a French nation.[479]

Nonetheless, given that the anonymous author probably came from the southern Italy, it was hardly this embryonic nationalistic identity on which he drew when he named the crusaders *Franci*. Furthermore, it would have been possible, and far less doubtful, to exploit the Norman history. For, Bohemond and the other Southern-Italians were direct descendants of those Normans who had set forth from Scandinavia to the

[476] For the general and political history of France in the high Middle Ages, see Hallam 1980 and Bull (ed.) 2002.
[477] Schneidmüller 2002, 15–26. For a more thorough study on the ethno-political terminology and the birth of France as a nation, see Schneidmüller 1987. See also Wood 1995, 47–57.
[478] Schneidmüller 2002, 27–32.
[479] Schneidmüller 2002, 32–34.

northern part of *Francia*, who had then established their colony into a fairly independent duchy, and of whom a part had recently sailed to south and conquered parts of Italian Peninsula and Sicily, fighting against both the Byzantine Emperor and the Muslims, while at the same time in the north, the other Normans had managed to conquer most of the British Isles.[480] Despite this potentially exploitable heritage, it was not *Normanni* but *Franci* that was employed in the anonymous narrative.[481] In fact, the only character whom the author consistently designates as *Normannus* is Robert II "Curthose", the duke of Normandy and the eldest son of William the Conqueror. As Emily Albu has noticed, the author does not give Robert a significant role in the narrative – he even ignores the ducal title, calling Robert *comes* instead of the legitimate title *dux*.[482] This derogation might reflect some political grudge now lost to us, yet what comes out clear is that in the anonymous narrative *Normannus* as a title was clearly inferior to *Francus*. Possible reasons for this can be grasped by taking a glance at the epilogue of the third book, where the author discusses the qualities of the enemy:

> What man, however experienced and learned, would dare to write about the skill, prowess, and courage of the Turks, who thought that they would strike terror into the Franks, as they had done into the Arabs, Saracens, Armenians, Syrians, and Greeks by the menace of their arrows? Yet, please God, their men will never be as good as ours. They have a saying that they are of common stock with the Franks, and that no men, except the Franks and themselves, are naturally born to be knights. This is true, and nobody dare to deny it. If they only had stood firm in the faith of Christ and holy Christendom, and had been willing to accept One God in Three Persons, and had believed rightly and faithfully that the Son of God was born of a virgin mother, that he suffered, and rose from the dead and ascended in the sight of his disciples into Heaven, and sent them in full measure the comfort of the Holy Ghost, and that he reigns in heaven and earth, you could not find stronger or braver or more skilful soldiers; and yet by God's grace they were beaten by our men.[483]

---

[480] See Hallam 1980, 34–43. As the eldest son of Robert d'Hauteville, Bohemond had led the conquest of Italy.

[481] See for example an episode where the emir of Antioch, seeing that the Turks were fleeing before the "the Frankish army" (*Francorum exercitum*), asks for "a Frankish banner" (*Francorum uexilla*) as a sign for resign and protection. First the emir is given the banner of the count of St Gilles but he refuses when he finds out that it is not Bohemond's banner, which then is provided. The message is that Bohemond is the real Frank who conquered the city. Although that it is not here nor anywhere else stated explicitly, Bohemond and the other Italians are described as *Franci*. See GF xxix (70–71). For the other instanced listed, see Bull 1997, 196 n. 3.

[482] Albu 2001, 153–155. In some manuscripts, the title is reinstated, for this see Hill 1962, pp. xxxix–xl.

[483] "Quis unquam tam sapiens aut doctus audebit describere prudentiam militiamque et fortitudinem Turcorum? Qui putabant terrere gentem Francorum minis suarum sagittarum, sicut terruerunt Arabes, Saracenos, et Hermenios, Surianos et Grecos. Sed si Deo placet nunquam tantum ualebunt, quantum nostri. Verumtamen dicunt se esse de Francorum generatione, et quia nullus homo naturaliter debet esse miles nisi Franci et illi. Veritatem dicam quam nemo audebit prohibere. Certe si in fide Christi et Christianitate sancta semper firmi fuisset, et unum Deum in trinitate confiteri uoluissent Deique Filium natum de Virgine matre, passum, et resurrixisse a mortuis et in caelum ascendisse suis cernentibus

The purpose of this passage was to describe the enemy as being worthy of fighting against: the Turks were truly formidable opponents, lacking only the true faith of the Frankish knight – and still the Franks defeated them. The passage bears two interesting features considering our question, the first being that of the Franks as the naturally born knights. Marcus Bull has argued that the myth of Frankish military might was the decisive factor in the tendency to describe the crusaders as Franks. For, there simply was, as he argues, none other such a powerful image in the Western Europe.[484] One should note that it was not only the scriptoriums in the support of the French monarchy but also the lively oral culture, particularly popular songs and poems, which generated this imagery.[485] These images did not follow the borders of the kingdom of France, for they draw on the Carolingian past that had much wider dissemination. It was therefore possible to name as *Franci* all those who belonged to the elite of the old empire – i.e. practically the entire western Christendom. Not surprisingly then, the Anonymous claimed that the crusaders followed the road which Charlemagne, "the magnificent king of Francia", had allegedly established.[486] The assertion was legendary, yet it rested on the popular belief about Charlemagne's pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Constantinople.[487]

Another interesting feature in the above-mentioned excerpt is the claim that the Turks had a common ancestry with the Franks. Both Baldric and Guibert reiterated the story but added that it was merely a Turkish belief, whereas the Anonymous strongly assured of its veracity.[488] Furthermore, although following closely his source, Baldric slightly downgraded the attributes attached to the Turks: from "prudence", "prowess" and "courage" to "ability", "cunning" and "belligerence".[489] Evidently, Baldric was somewhat disturbed by the portrayal of the Turks as a prominent enemy. Against this, it is quite surprising that Guibert, taking into account his utterly demonised image of the enemy, actually reiterated this passage at all. Robert did not. This was definitely not due to any dispute about the anonymous' argument considering the Franks. After all, it was

---

discipulis, consolationemque Sancti Spiritus perfecte misisse; et eum in caelo et in terra regnantem fortiores uel bellorum ingeniosissimos nullus inuenire potuisset. Et tamen gratia Dei uicti sunt a nostris." GF ix (21).

[484] Bull 1997, 205–207.

[485] Schneidmüller 2002, 36, 37.

[486] "…uenerunt per uiam quam iamdudum Karolus Magnus mirificus rex Franciae aptari fecit usque Constantinopolim." GF ii (2).

[487] Sweetenham 2005, 51 n. 27. For the legend and its exploitation, Stuckey 2008, 137–152.

[488] GN III.xi.649; BB II.iii (35g–36a).

[489] "…prudentiam militiamque et fortitudinem Turcorum", GF ix (21); "…indubitanter viri [Turci] sunt ingeniosi, callidi et bellicosi…", BB II.iii (36a). All the attributes used by Baldric are ambiguous because they have both positive and negative meanings. It is therefore difficult to translate them. Nevertheless, all the original attributes are entirely positive, which makes the tendency for demotion apparent.

Robert who made the most out of the memory of Charlemagne. In his version, the implicit parallel between the crusade and Charlemagne's legendary pilgrimage has become explicitely proclaimed.[490] Moreover, in his version of the sermon in Clermont, the pope appeals to the sense of martial honour of his audience by summoning the memories of their ancestors "Charlemagne, his son Louis and your other kings who destroyed the pagan kingdoms and brought them within the bounds of Christendom".[491] In this way, Robert further developed the theme of heroic past, still inchoate in the anonymous narrative.

The depiction of Bohemond and the Southern-Italians as *Franci* was not straightforward. Even though the Benedictines deliberately followed the Anonymous in this interpretation, the inclusion of the Italian *Normanni* to *Franci* seems to have required some justification. Robert discussed this in an invented speech of Bohemond, who exhorts his troops to join the crusade. "Are we not Franks?", Bohemond questioned his men and continued, "Didn't our parents come from Francia and take this land for themselves by force of arms?"[492] Moreover, he bewailed that it would be utterly shameful for them and their children if their "kinsmen and brothers" made the journey without them.[493] Here the implicit statement of the Anonymous is outspoken: the South-Italian Normans were indeed *Franci*. The assertion is complemented also later, when Robert comments Bohemond's departing from the main force. He writes that Bohemond "had inherited the highest principles from his Frankish father, yet he followed the footsteps of his Apulian mother."[494] Apparently, the Frankish elements gave rise to Bohemond's virtues, while his vices resulted from his non-Frankish bloodline.

---

[490] RM I.v (732b).

[491] "Moveant vos et incitent animos vestros ad virilitatem gesta praedecessorum vestrorum, probitas et magnitudo Karoli Magni regis, et Ludovici filii ejus aliorumque regum vestrorum, qui regna paganorum destruxerunt et in eis fines sanctae Ecclesiae dilataverunt." RM I.i (728c). Sweetenham's translation.

[492] "Nonne et nos Francigenae sumus? Nonne parentes nostri de Francia venerunt, et terram hanc militaribus armis sibi mancipaverunt?" RM II.iv (741e).

[493] "Proh dedecus! Ibunt consanguinei et fratres nostri sine nobis ad martyrium, imo ad Paradisum? In omnibus futuris temporibus debet ascribi tam nobis quam liberis nostris retrograda animi inopia, si, nobis absentibus, agitur haec divina militia." RM II.ic (741e–f).

[494] "Ibi quippe divisit se Boamundus ab eis et ab omni exercitu Dei; habuitque a patre suo, qui Francigena fuit, optima principia; sed a matre, quae Apuliensis exstitit, retinuit vestigia." RM VIII.xv (855). In Sweetenham's view the chapter is suspiciously short. This and the view that Robert's narrative was intended as propaganda for Bohemond's recruiting has led her to suspect that this passage might in fact be a later interpolation. I cannot deny this possibility, but in my opinion the passage is not in conflict with Robert's portrayal of Bohemond; that is, Bohemond is not more central in Robert's narrative than in the *Gesta*, neither is he intentionally glorified. Actually I would argue rather the opposite: that the role of Bohemond is somewhat balanced in favour of the other characters. Furthermore, the chapter division it self is probably of later date, as Sweetenham suggests at another place. Thus this chapter would not be unusually short but made for the later readers. Without the chapter division, this passage does not strike as an interpolation – unless we hold to the interpretation that Robert's work was written to support Bohemond's cause. For Sweetenham's views, see Sweetenham 2005, 5–7, 191 n. 38; for chapter division as a later addition: 101 n. 1, 69. For the Benedictine views on Bohemond, see note 61 in Introduction.

In similar mode, Guibert claimed that since Bohemond's family originally came from *Normannia*, which was "known to be part of *Francia*", and because he had (later) married the daughter of the king of France (*rex Francorum*), "he might very well be considered a *Francus*".[495] It is interesting, however, that by this statement Guibert contradicted the aforementioned differentiation by Baldric between *Normanni* and *Francigena*. This may actually reflect the differences in the regio-cultural identities of the authors: while Guibert (and probably Robert) lived and wrote at the very heart of the kingdom, Baldric resided in the northwestern fringes of it. The monastery of Bourgueil belonged to the county of Anjou and was located near the duchy of Brittany; Dol, moreover, was at the very border of Brittany and Normandy. Hence, Baldric must have been well aware of the strong sense of local identities in these areas.[496] In this light, it is understandable that he was relatively moderate in his usage of Frankish terminology: in Norman or Breton ears, the name *Franci* would probably not have designated themselves, but their neighbours.[497]

Baldric nevertheless employed the term *Franci* as a collective noun for all the crusaders.[498] He made use of it especially in the passages underlining the ferocity and bravery of the crusaders. For example, the Anonymous tells us that during the siege of Nicaea the crusaders, seeing that the Turks used boats for supply, engineered a stealthy assault with boats full of Turcopoles[499]. At first, the Turks could not distinguish between an enemy and a friend, but then, realizing that they were under naval attack, they gave up at once.[500] Baldric explains that the Turks were terrified by the "unknown arms" of the Franks, so that mere brilliance of the arms scared them to death. Moreover they knew that "this fierce people" was "merciless towards those whom they had defeated". Hence they did not dare to resist them.[501] So even in those places of the original story where there was no mention of Frankishness, Baldric invented some.[502] The memory of Frankish military power was apparently too overwhelming for him to ignore. However,

---

[495] "Qui cum genus ex Northmannia ducat, quam Franciae partem esse constat, ob hoc vel maxime Francus habebitur, quia regis Francorum filiae coniugio iam potitur." GN I.v.568–571.
[496] Hallam 1980, 34–43, 52; Packard 2011, 60; Bull 1996, 39. The issue of a distinct Norman identity is disputed, however, see Shopkow 1997, 14–15; Albu 2001, 2–3.
[497] Bull 1997, 200.
[498] See for example BB I.xxv (29b–c); BB II.i (34b–e); BB II.v (38a–b).
[499] Turcopoles were Turks who were recruited in the Christian army.
[500] GF viii.16–17.
[501] "Exterrebant eos arma incognita, et ipse fulgor armorum obsessos exanimat; noverant Francorum gentem ferocem et bellicosam, nec eos ab incepto desistere, donec omnia eis pro voto contigerint; sciebant eos penitus immisericordes, quos ipsi exacerbaverant, gentis suae peremptores." BB I.xxv (29h).
[502] The Anonymous writes that the Turks were "afraid to death, wailing and lamenting" at the sight of the Turcopoles. The Franks, on the other hand, "rejoiced and gave glory to God". The Turcopoles were, of course, Byzantine troops. Yet this fact is ignored in the Baldric's narrative, giving thus all the glory to "the Franks". See GF viii (16); compare to BB I.xxv–xxvi (29).

Baldric was not overtly enthusiastic to describe all the crusaders as *Franci*, possibly because he thought the term too exclusive. Neither did he indulge in lauding the French as a nation. Whenever possible, he seems to have preferred the term *Christiani* as the common term for the crusaders.

In contrast, Guibert's discussion of the Franks is undeniably the most distinctively nationalistic in tone. In his second book, Guibert made his point rather straight, claiming that it had been an ancient custom of the popes to rely on the Franks in any troubles.[503] This was because the Franks, unlike any other people, were unwilling to behave insolently against God.[504] In his eyes, the behaviour of the Germans (*Teutonici*), and especially those of "the kingdom of Lothrangia", was in the direct opposite of this. In their "barbaric obstinacy" they struggled against the instructions of Saint Peter and his pontiffs, "preferring to remain under daily or even eternal excommunication rather than submit".[505] The fact that the crusade was an international movement could not go unnoticed even for Guibert.[506] Yet in his eyes, the call for crusade was originally addressed only to the Franks; all the other Christians joined the movement "thinking that they owed the same kind of allegiance to God as the Franks did".[507] And even if the effort was admittedly positive, the outcome was not always so. Therefore, the failures during the crusade could be addressed to the other nations, especially the Germans.[508] Guibert's distaste for them is manifested especially in his recital of his own words to a certain archdeacon of Mainz who he claimed of vilifying the Franks:

> If you think them so weak and languid that you can denigrate a name known and admired as far away as the Indian Ocean, then tell me upon whom did Pope Urban call for aid against the Turks? Wasn't it the French? Had they not been present, attacking the barbarians everywhere, pouring their sturdy energy and fearless strength into the battle, there would have been no help for your Germans, whose reputation there amounted to nothing.[509]

---

[503] GN II.i.26–34.
[504] "Ceteris enim gentibus erga beatum Petrum ergaque pontificalia decreta timoratius humiliusque se habuit gens eadem, nec temeritate, qua alii assolent, velamen malitiae arripere contra deum voluit libertatem." GN II.i.34–38.
[505] "Videmus iam annis emensis plurimus Teutonicos, immo totius Lotharingiae regnum, beati Petri eiusque pontificum preceptis barbarica quadam obstinatione reniti et ambienter malle aut diuturno sive sempiterno anathemati subiacere quam subici." GN II.i.38–42.
[506] For example, GN I.i.111–.
[507] "Cum solam quasi specialiter Francorum gentem super hac re commonitorium apostolicae sedis attigerit, quae gens christiano sub iure agens non ilico turmas edidit et, dum pensant se deo eandem fidem debere quam Franci, Francorum, quibus possunt viribus nituntur et ambiunt communicare discrimini?" GN I.i.106–111.
[508] See Chapter 3.2.
[509] "Si ita eos inertes arbitraris et marcidos ut celeberrimum usque in Oceanum Indicum nomen fede

Against this, it is interesting to recall that, as discussed in Chapter 3.2, Robert called Godfrey of Bouillon *dux Teuthonicorum* and associated him with *Alamanni*. Evidently then, he did not share Guibert's distaste for "Germans". In contrast, Robert clearly endeavoured to dissipate any breaches in his harmonious picture of the crusade. In Guibert's chronicle, however, the words *Francus* and *Francia* are used in a more restrictive sense than in the other narratives. *Franci* are not only set against *Angli* and *Itali*, but the term notably excluded also those who were part of the Carolingian empire: *Teutonici*, *Lothrangi*, *Langobardi*, *Ligures*, and *Britones*.[510] In general, it seems that Guibert saw as *Franci* only those who were part of the western kingdom of *Francia* – i.e. approximately those who were later known as the French. The only deviation from the rule seems to have been Bohemond and the other southern Italians. Without this compromise, however, it would have been impossible to describe the expedition as Frankish because Bohemond was no doubt one of the main leaders during the expedition. Yet, even more important than this might have been the fact that Guibert's main source was narrated from the South-Italian perspective. Consequently, it would have been quite impractical to exclude these Normans from being Franks.

Although using the word *Franci* differently, both Guibert and Robert considered the Franks as the chosen people of God. According to Guibert, God reserved the task of crusading to them because they had always been catholic in their faith;[511] the Franks were the "sons of God", upon whom all the burden of the journey fell and who eventually "redeemed the holy city by their blood".[512] Robert claims that the Frankish accomplishments were due to their position as God's heirs: "For what king or prince could subjugate so many towns and castles, fortified by nature, design or human ingenuity, if not *the blessed the nation* of the Franks, *whose God is the Lord: the people whom he hath chosen for his inheritance*."[513]

As suggested by Bull, it is probable that the crusaders generated a sense of shared identity during their journey.[514] Yet it is important to remember that the unity as

---

garriendo detorqueas, dic michi ad quos papa Urbanus contra Turcos presidia contracturus divertit: nonne ad Francos? Hi nisi preissent et barbariem undecumque confluentium gentium vivaci industria et impavidis viribus constrinxissent, Teutonicorum vestrorum, quorum ne nomen quidem ibi sonuit, auxilia nulla fuissent." GN II.i.48–55. Levine's translation.

[510] GN I.i.106–107, VII.xxiv.1280–1290.

[511] GN II.i.55–.

[512] GN VII.xxi.964–965, VII.xliii.1995–1996, II.i.55–79.

[513] "Nam quis regum aut principum posset subigere tot civitates et castella, natura, arte seu humano ingenio praemunita, nisi Francorum *beata gens, cujus est Dominus Deus ejus, populus quem elegit in hereditatem sibi*?" RM, prologus (725); Psalmi 32:12.

[514] Bull 1997, 201, 211.

promulgated by the crusade chronicles is a later retrospection which consolidated the evolving crusade movement. It is not only a reflection of a shared identity but also a vehicle for legitimacy. One aspect in this is that the nationalistic overtones were tightly connected to the image of Franks as the military heroes. That is what we shall consider next.

4.3 Epic Hero and the Audience

> As the Turks marched to the castle they came upon Walter, the captain and standard-bearer of Peter's army. Despite his record as a famous soldier with a string of military successes, he was unable to withstand their combined might and sold his death dearly for a high price of Turkish blood, flinging himself on them like a starving bear on its prey and striking down and killing those who crossed his path. Similarly, the armed men with him, still alive but about to suffer, punished the enemy as long as their arms lasted; so that their enemies were unable to celebrate the victory. But sheer numbers defeated their courage rather than courage defeating numbers, even though their bravery reduced the number of their opponents six-fold. Eventually their weapons – though not their bravery – gave out, and they ended their lives with exemplary death in battle. Thus God and the angelic spirits took their souls up to Heaven. It was then that the Turks first realised, as they turned over the bodies of their own men, that it was Franks they had been fighting.[515]

In all the Benedictine narratives, one can find a shared tendency to dwell on those parts of the story which show prospects for describing the admirable nature of the army, the atmosphere during a battle, or an exemplary heroism of particular characters. Thus, besides being pious and disciplined, the crusaders were also depicted as epic heroes, fearlessly defending their comrades and fiercely slaughtering their demonical enemies. Although already present in the *Gesta Francorum*, these themes were significantly elaborated by the Benedictines – especially in Robert's version of the story. Yet, the strategies for executing these elaborations differed substantially in style. At the end of this chapter, I will argue that these stylistic decisions point to dissimilar intended audiences between the Benedictine chronicles.

It is worth of notice that quite often all the Benedictines inserted their

[515] "Contra quod Turci dum cursum dirigerent, obviaverant Waltero, qui erat primicerius et signifer agminis Heremitae; sed miles egregius licet claruisset tot militiae titulis, his tamen omnino resistere non valuit, sed tamen pretiosam mortem suam multo Turcorum sanguine commendavit. Irruit enim in illos velut ursus esuriens inter animalia; et quos in occursum invenit, et prostravit et vita privavit. Similiter et qui cum eo erant armati, adhuc vivi jam necem quam erant passuri fortiter vindicabant; et quandiu eis arma valuerunt, hostes de victoria nunquam tripudiaverunt. Sed ibi multitudo audaciam, non audacia multitudinem superavit, et non animis, laudabili morte, sicut in bello, sicut pro Deo, vitam terminaverunt, eosque in sortem coelitum angelici spiritus transtulerunt. Tunc primum Turci, revolutis cadaveribus suorum, cognoverunt quia, cum quibus pungaverant, Franci fuerunt." RM I.xi (735). Compare to *The Song of Roland*, 2389–2396.

interpolations roughly at the same places in the narrative – places that were somehow indicated in the original story. Besides speeches, which were already discussed in Chapter 2.1, this is also evident in the descriptions of the battles. For instance, in his account of the battle of Nicaea the Anonymous wrote that the siege had to be ceased for night because it was impossible to fight in the dark.[516] For Guibert, this short description designated a proper place for inserting a little poem of four dactylic hexameters.[517] In the epic tradition, based on Homer, Virgil, and the other classical authors, hexameter was the standard convention for writing epic poetry. One of the central themes under this tradition was the heroic battle of the main characters, fighting against great fiends and monsters or each other.[518] It is hardly a coincidence then that also the other two writers began to draw on epic roughly at the same place in the narrative.

Shortly after the aforementioned passage, the Anonymous wrote that when all the forces had finally assembled, they were so numerous that it was impossible to count them all: "I do not think that anyone has ever seen, or will ever again see, so many valiant knights."[519] Both Baldric and Guibert grasped this opportunity for celebration. Baldric compared the crusader army with the ancient examples. For him the imperious camp was like a tabernacle, rising clearly above all the encampments that were described in the classical literature, and thus overshadowing even the great deeds of Odysseus, Ajax, and Achilles.[520] It is in this passage that most of the features regarding the ideal knighthood and army are described. Similarly, also Guibert inserted here his lengthy praise of the ideal warrior.[521] However, unlike Baldric, he also lauds the reins and trappings of the horses, the armour of the crusaders, their helmets, shields, swords, as well as their siege equipment.[522] All this is put into (catalectic) adonic verses, followed by several hexameters discussing about the prevalence of the crusading army

[516] "Sero autem facto, cecidit turris iam in nocte, sed quia nox erat, non potuerunt preliari cum illis." GF viii (15).
[517] "Ast ubi nubila nox indixit utrinque quietem,/ lapsa facit subitam turris castrata ruinam./ Tempora sed noctis quia sunt minus apta duellis,/ Francigenae cessant ne Turcos nocte lacessant." GN III.vi.303–306.
[518] For the classical epic tradition, see for example Hardie 2005, 83–100.
[519] "Fueruntque ibi omnes congregati in unum. Et quis poterat numerare tantam Christi militiam? Nullus ut puto tot prudentissimos milites nec antea uidit nec ultra uidere poterit." GF viii (16). Hill's translation.
[520] "O castra speciosa! o tentoria imperiosa! quis unquam similia vidit tabernacula? Cesset illa adulabilis fabula de Troja; vilescant illa Pelasgorum tentoria; obscurentur ulterius procerum illorum actus et nomina. Illic Ulixes suam exercuit astutiam; Ajax suam ostentavit audaciam; Achilles suam manifestavit duritiam." BB I.xxiv (28c).
[521] GN III.viii.
[522] "...Campus equorum/ <f>lore nitebat/ et phalerarum/ forma sonusque/ cuique placebat,/ lux toracarum/ pulchior haustis/ solibus ibat/ ereque flavo/ cassis et umbo,/ limbus eodem/ fulgidus extat./ Hosce videres/ turbinis instar/ ariete crebro/ volvere muros./ Repperit artus/ cuspis eorum/ Francica duros,/ obtudit enses/ crebrius ossis/ vulnus acutos..." GN III.viii.372–393.

over various classical examples. Thus, by these comparisons, both authors strived to demonstrate that the crusaders were better than the ancients – not only in faith and *mores*, but also in terms of martial prowess and boldness.[523] This is one of the probable reasons why Guibert turned from prose to verse at this and similar places. An incentive for this could be that it was only customary to discuss the martial deeds and heroism in epic metre. Hence, it should not be surprising that also Robert began his first hexameters at the same point of the narrative.[524]

Yet, the classical epic was not the only tradition for describing the battles. The most important in this respect was the popular vernacular poetry that we know as the *chansons de geste* ("songs of deeds"). These oral poems or songs discussed the heroic feats of particular historical and fictive characters, focusing on themes of exemplary bravery as well as the fidelity towards God and one's liege lord.[525] Popular songs of the "great deeds" were of course sung already before the First Crusade.[526] The problem, however, is that all the extant literary sources for *chansons de geste* post-date both the First Crusade and the narratives in question. One possible exception to this could be the *Song of Roland*, which in its current form might have been compiled in the early twelfth century – yet the exact date of this poem is unknown.[527] It is evident that all the surviving versions of the epic poetry are greatly affected by both the crusading movement and the chronicles describing the First Crusade.[528] Consequently, we cannot sort out exactly which parts or elements in the chronicles were allusions to or taken from the *chansons*, and which, on the other hand, were influences to the other direction.[529]

Nonetheless, the resemblances with the *chansons* cannot be denied. Some elements like the mirroring technique for portraying the Muslim enemy are present

---

[523] This theme is prominent also with the other crusade narratives, see Packard 2011, 51–52.
[524] "Jamque sudesque, faces, lapides jaculantur in urbem: / Hostis terretur, quia jam de morte timetur; / Unde fragor turbae clamorque sonabat in urbe." RM III.iii (756e).
[525] For a classic study on the form and content of the *chanson de geste*, see Rychner 1955.
[526] Bloch 1982, 92–93.
[527] *The Song of Roland*. An Analytical Edition. 2 volumes. Ed. & transl. by Gerard J. Brault. The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park 1978. For dating, see Brault 1978, 3–6. The earliest manuscript, residing in the Bodleian Library in Oxford (Digby 23), is dated to the second quarter of the twelfth century. It has been fully digitalized and can be examined at: http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet.
[528] See for example *The Song of Roland*, 1523–1525, "Jerusalem prist ja par traïsun,/ Si violat le temple Salomon,/ Le patriarche ocist devant les funz". Compare to RM I.xii, and the descriptions of the pollution of holy places. For a thorough study on the influence of crusading on the extant *chansons de geste*, see Trotter 1987. Graindor de Douai, the compilator of *Chanson d'Antioche*, draw significantly on Robert's chronicle (as well as the narrative by Albert of Aachen). Similarly, there is also an Old French poem partially based on Baldric's narrative. Sweetenham 2005, 36, 37–40; Edgington & Sweetenham 2011, 15–19. For the genesis and literary history of *Chanson d'Antioche*, see Edgington & Sweetenham 2011, 1–48.
[529] Kangas 2007, 40–45; Sweetenham 2005, 35–36; Bull 1993, 13; and Brault 1978, 9 n. 54.

already in the *Gesta Francorum*.[530] Another example is the narration of the battle of River Pharphar during the siege of Antioch. The Anonymous writes that the crusaders charged the enemy fiercely and attacked them so boldly that the enemy began to flee across a bridge. But the bridge was so narrow that many perished, either because of the pressure of congestion or in the waters of the river. The scene is relatively vivid by the Anonymous' standards. He describes how the river ran red with blood as the crusaders hacked everyone trying to get on the bank.[531] The whole episode has some murky reminiscences of the *Roland*,[532] and it catches the eye because most of the descriptions about battles in the anonymous narrative are almost laconic in style.[533] Against this, the description is almost poetic:

> The din and the shouts of our men and the enemy echoed to heaven, and the shower of missiles and arrows covered the sky and hid the daylight. The Christian women who were in the city came to the windows in the walls, and when they saw the wretched fate of the Turks they clapped their hands secretly.[534]

The mention of women is a rather peculiar one, for it seems to point to the nascent tournament culture where the women stood on terraces watching the performance of their favourites.[535] It is not generally agreed that the Anonymous had used any literal sources for his chronicle. Yet, because there are some obvious allusions to the *chansons* in many parts of the narrative, it seems evident that the author was acquainted with the popular epic songs, using them at least as an inspiration while writing his chronicle.

Both Guibert and Baldric recounted the aforementioned passage closely.[536] Yet, the latter lays significant stress on the theme of vengeance and depicts the women in a different light, so that they are regarding the success of the crusaders with ill will.[537] Here Baldric also mentions that Godfrey of Bouillon stroke a certain Turk with such

---

[530] Hill 1962, p. xv; Sweetenham 2005, 13 n. 6.
[531] GF xvii (41).
[532] Cf. *The Song of Roland*, 1341–1344, 2460–2474.
[533] For example GF xxxiiii (83): "Tunc exeuntes quatuordecim ex nostris militibus, ierunt contra Tripolim urbem, quae erat secus nos. Isti quatuordecim inuenerunt circa sexaginta Turcos, et alios quosdam; qui habebant ante se collectos homines, et animalia plus quam mille quingenta. Qui signo crucis muniti inuaserunt eos, et Deo iuuante mirabiliter superauerunt illos, et occiderunt sex ex illis, apprehenderuntque sex equos."
[534] "Rumor quoque et clamor nostrorum et illorum resonabat ad caelum. Pluuiae telorum et sagittarum tegebant polum, et claritatem diei. Mulieres Christianae urbis ueniebant ad muri fenestras, spectantes misera fata Turcorum, et occulte plaudebant manibus." GF xvii (41). Hill's translation.
[535] On the tournament culture, see Crouch 2005 and Barber & Barker 1989.
[536] GN IV.xiv.702–707; BB II.xvii (50c–51b).
[537] "Mulieres a murorum et propugnaculorum spectaculis, et suorum miserias prospectabant, et successivis Francorum prosperitatibus invidebant." BB II.xvii (51a–b).

force that he managed to cut the body in half.[538] Robert made this achievement the central subject of the entire episode.[539] He writes that Godfrey, "an outstanding ornament of chivalry", slaughtered the enemy who "feared his sword like death". They could not resist him but "offered him their naked bodies".[540] Then one of them, "bolder than the rest, unusually heavily built and of greater strength, rather like another Goliath",[541] having spotted Godfrey, galloped towards him and stroke so forcefully that the sword sliced through his shield. Nevertheless, God protected his chosen and guided Godfrey in deflecting this deadly blow. "Ablazed with furious anger", Godfrey assailed his adversary, and delivered such a counter-blow that it broke the enemy in half:

> He raised the sword and plunged it into the left side of his shoulder blades with such force that it split the chest down from the middle, slashed through the spine and vital organs and, slippery with blood, came out unbroken above the right leg. As a result, the whole of the head and the right side slipped down into the water, whilst the part remaining on the horse was carried back into the city.[542]

This episode is not recorded in the *Gesta Francorum* but can be found in some manuscripts of Tudebode's account.[543] Moreover, also Guibert recorded it in another part of his narrative, noting that the remarkable deed was based on a "reliable, accurate testimony".[544] Baldric wrote similarly that the feat was "related by many".[545] This would suggest that the story of Godfrey and the Giant was circulating widely in Europe during the early twelfth century when the two Benedictines wrote their chronicles. Apart from Robert, however, none of the authors truly elaborated the subject; all of them merely mention it, almost incidentally.

The episode in question contains striking resemblances to *chansons*. For example, at the end part of the *Song of Roland*, there is an interesting account of the judicial duel between Pinabel and Thierry who fight to find out whether Ganelon had

---

[538] BB II.xvii (50g).
[539] RM IV.xx–xxi (786–788).
[540] "militiae decus egregium", "gladium ducis ut mortem expavescebant, et tamen vitare non poterant…illi minime renitentes, nuda corpora inviti offerebant.". RM IV.xx (786d–f). Sweetenham's translation.
[541] "Quumque unus ex eis audacior ceteris, et mole corporis praestantior, et viribus, ut alter Golias, robustior…" RM V.xx (786f–787a). Sweetenham's translation.
[542] "Ensem elevat, eumque a sinistra parte scapularum tanta virtute intorsit, quod pectus medium disjunxit, spinam et vitalia interrupit, et sic lubricus ensis super crus dextrum integer exicit; sicque caput integrum cum dextra parte corporis immersit gurgiti, partemque quae equo praesidebat remisit civitati." RM IV.xx (787b–c).
[543] PT III.viii (47).
[544] "…ita ut testimonio veraci probabile id de ipso preclari facinoris cantitetur…" GN VII.xi.489–490.
[545] "In hac siquidem pugna, ut a multis relatum est…" BB II.xvii (50g).

betrayed Roland and Charlemagne or was innocent.[546] Thierry is described as slightly delicate – not puny, but hardly great neither. Whereas Pinabel is so strong and agile that few can stand before his blows. The knights engage into combat, fighting first on horseback and then dismounted, but soon it comes out clear that Pinabel has the upper hand: he strikes Thierry on the helmet so that the grass catches fire from the resulting sparks. Thierry's helmet is wrenched, hauberk torn apart, and his cheek bleeds. Yet he does not fall, for God had already decided to support the right cause. Thierry makes his counter-attack and slices straight through the head of his opponent. The fight is over and Ganelon receives the just punishment.

The narrative elements are quite the same as in the battle between Godfrey and the Giant: the attack of a physically superior opponent against which the hero is protected by God, as well as the counter-strike that slices the enemy in half. The latter of these is actually a frequent formula in the *Roland*, repeated whenever the main characters deliver deadly blows upon their enemies.[547] For instance, in one episode Roland strikes with his spear until it breaks, then grasps his sword, Durendal, spurs on his horse, cuts his enemy slicing him in two, and utters, "Scoundrel, your doom was sealed when you set out!"[548] Virtually all of the laisses regarding combat recount the same elements: breaking of shield/helmet, dismantling of armour, splitting of body, (occasionally followed by a description of the resulting gore) and finally the closing remarks.[549]

Besides the example of Godfrey, the correspondences of this and similar passages can be seen in Robert's description of Hugh of Vermandois who engaged an enemy, "bolder than the rest", spurred his horse, and thrust his lance into the throat of his opponent. "And what did the wretch do?" Robert asks "– he fell immediately to the ground and yielded his soul to the infernal deities."[550] Similarly in the *Roland*, one of the twelve peers thrusts with spear at the enemy, strikes through his shield and armour, impales his body, and sends his soul to Satan.[551] Only in Robert's version is this kind of epic narration invoked. As an illustrative example of the contrast to the other narratives, we can take an episode of the battle of Ma'arrat-an-Nu'man.

---

[546] *The Song of Roland*, 3815–3933.
[547] On this formula, see Ashby-Beach 1985.
[548] "Culvert, mar i moüstes!" *The Song of Roland*, 1335. Brault's translation.
[549] See for example verses 1261–1379 (laisses 96–107).
[550] "Quid miser faceret? solo statim corruit, et diis infernalibus animam commendavit." RM VII.xi (831e). Sweetenham's translation, see also p. 171 n. 31.
[551] *The Song of Roland*, 1261–1268. For further examples listed, see Sweetenham 2005, 61–62.

According to the *Gesta*, a certain Gouffier of Lastours[552] was first to climb up on the town walls. Behind him the siege ladder collapsed, leaving only few men on the top of the wall. The others took another ladder, set it up, and tried again to storm the walls. Yet they encountered so fierce resistance that "many were terrified and jumped off the wall". However, those "most gallant" men who remained on it managed to resist the enemy, while the others began to undermine the defences of the city. Seeing this, the Saracens finally retreated into the city.[553]

In the anonymous narrative, the episode does not stand out from the rest of the story. Even though Gouffier and the others are depicted fighting bravely against the enemy, the narration does not contain significant epic overtones. The passage is closely followed in the chronicles of Guibert and Baldric, as well as those of Raymond and Tudebode.[554] Yet in Robert's version of the story, the scene is entirely different.[555] In it, Gouffier stands out clearly as the ultimate hero. His presence inspires others to continue fighting, and his shield protects firmly all his men against the enemy while his sword inflicts fear upon them. Robert writes that

> …Golfier was sweating from the strain of battle: all the enemies were fighting him and his companions, whilst he and they stood against all. His shield was the powerful bulwark which protected all his men, at least from the enemies on the wall. The short and narrow stretch of wall did not allow any ally to come and join him, or more than one enemy to approach. So not one of the enemies could overcome Golfier, whilst he overcame large numbers of them. In fact, none dared to approach within striking distance any longer, each fearing for himself the fate Golfier's sword had inflicted on others. They flung weapons, arrows, stakes and stones at him; and his shield was so weighed down by them that it could no longer be lifted by one man alone.[556]

In Robert's narration, Gouffier is taken as the point of reference on which the course of battle is reflected: he and his companions alone fight against the entire horde of enemies; and when the situation is at its worst, Gouffier, "the most mighty man", is

---

[552] "Gulferius de Daturre", also known as "Golfier" in the literature, was a knight from Lastours, Limousin. He survived the crusade and died at an unknown date post 1126.

[553] GF xxxxiii (79).

[554] GN VI.xviii.569–; BB III.xxv (85b–g); RA xiv (270a); PT IV.xliv–xlv (155).

[555] RM VIII.vi–vii (847–849). According to Sweetenham & Paterson 2003, 9–10, 16, Robert's version (and that of Gilo's chronicle) might be based on an early version of the Occitan poem *Canso d'Antioca*, which in its present form post-dates Robert's chronicle. See also Sweetenham 2005, 36–37.

[556] "…Gulferius graviori pugna desundabat: quia omnes adversarii in eum et in consortes ejus, et ipse cum suis contra omnes. Clypeus ejus erat omnium suorum protectio fortis, ab his videlicet qui erant in muro. Muri brevis et arcta latitudo socium sibi conjungi non admittebat; nec adversarium, nisi unum, venire permittebat. Sed de Gulferio nullus hostium triumphavit, quum tamen ipse de compluribus triumphaverit. Propterea nemo jam illi occursare praesumebat, quia infortunium quod aliis ense illius contigerat unusquisque sibi metuebat. Tela, sagittas, sudes, lapides, illi jaciebant; tantumque clypeum ejus ex his oneraverant, quia jam ab uno homine levari non poterat." RM VIII.vi (847e–848b).

exhausted, sweat pouring "from all over his body onto the ground".[557] Then, at the critical moment, the other besiegers manage to undermine the wall – and the Saracens are petrified:

> Immediately the warmth of life left their bones,
> And chilly fear stole over their hearts.[558]

This gave Gouffier a new burst of energy. Without a shield or a helmet, only a bloodstained sword in his hand, he pursued after the fleeing enemy, "killing more through sheer terror than by sword".[559] Although the passage is possibly the most vivid one in Robert's narrative, it is by no means exceptional. Rather it represents his style at its height, making the most of the characteristic heroic elements. At the heart of these stands the interplay between fear and its counterparts: courage and intrepidity. As we saw, the ability to evoke fear upon the enemy, on one hand, and the resistance against such frailty, on the other, almost entirely defined the outcome of the battle. This thematic is quite often given metaphors from the animal world, so that the feeble enemy is described fleeing "as timid doves before a hawk"[560], whereas the crusaders engage the battle "like an eagle swooping its pray"[561] and fight the enemy like "enraged lions" or "starved bears".[562] Martial power, crucial for the success, was fundamentally dependent on bravery, although the source for it was the unfaltering faith in the divine support. Not always was this enough though, as can be seen in a passage on Walter "Sansavoir" and his companions who fought the numerically superior enemy to the last man, making them "pay highly for their blood". Eventually they all perished, yet it was not their "spirits" but their "weapons" that gave in.[563]

Arms and armour stand out as a prominent topos for Robert's narration. In a passage about the crusaders hunting down the fleeing enemy, Robert writes that "swords and spears of other people could be satiated with the blood of Turks; yet these were of

---

[557] "Jamque fortissimus vir fatigatus erat; jamque sudores toto corpore in terram defluebant…" RM VIII.vii (848c).
[558] "Concito vitalis calor ossa reliquit eorum,/Frigidus atque pavor possedit corda reorum." RM VIII.vii (848c–d). Sweetenham's translation.
[559] "Gulferius enim, qui paulo ante fatigatus deficiebat, novas iterum resumpserat vires; et jam non clypeo protectus aut galea, sed ensem rubeum tenens in dextera, fugientem celer insequitur hostem; pluresque mortificavit formidine quam gladio, qui seipsos praecipitaverunt de muro." RM VIII.vii (848d–e). Compare to *The Song of Roland*, 1320–1337.
[560] RM III.xvi (764f), IX.iv (865e).
[561] RM III.xi (761e).
[562] RM I.xi (735b), III.xvii (765e), IV.xv (784b–c), IX.vii (867b–c).
[563] RM I.xi (735).

Frankish origin and thus could not be blunted, nor tire of blood."[564] As we see, the martial ability to wreak havoc upon the enemy is again associated with *Francigena* – the Frankish origins. Interestingly, it is quite often the topos of weaponry that is employed when highlighting this motif. Albeit these topoi can be found already in the *Gesta*, they are much more exploited in Robert's version.

> Who could bear to look at the terrifying splendour of their arms? Their lances glittered like shining stars; their helmets and breastplates were like the brilliant light of growing dawn; the sound of their arms was more terrible than the roar of thunder.[565]

These words were put in the mouth of Suleiman (the Young), one of the Saracen commanders. The speech is originally from the *Gesta* but it has been completely reworked in Robert's version.[566] As we see, the weapons are not only used as verbal devices but they seem to carry significant meanings of prowess, strenght, and glory. The exact substance of these symbols is not easily defined. Nonetheless, the weaponry apparently communicated through the meanings which belonged to the martial reality – not to the monastic or ecclesiastical communities. It is intriguing enough that a Benedictine monk would considerably elaborate these messages in particular – unless, of course, he directed them to an audience who would understand and appreciate them.

Now, one should not assume that a monk would not understand the realities and values of the knightly world. On the contrary, both clerics and princes usually came from the same noble families.[567] Thus, possibly being brothers in the very literal sense, they might have shared the same values – even though their distinctively dissimilar education and different every day experiences certainly moulded their opinions.[568]

---

[564] "Illic satiari possent enses et tela aliarum gentium Turcorum sanguine; sed quia Francigenarum erant, nec obtundi poterant, nec repleri cruore." RM IV.xix (786c). Compare to the emphasis of swords in *The Song of Roland*, for example 1339, 1363–1364, 1462–1463.

[565] "Quorum oculi ferre poterant eorum terribilium armorum splendorem? Lanceae illorum micabant ut coruscantia sidera; galeae et loricae, ut vernantis aurorae lumina vibrantia; fragor armorum terribilior erat sonitu tonitruorum." RM III.xvii (765d). Sweetenham's translation. See also RM II.iii (741a–b): "Nam quis carneus oculus loricarum, aut galcarum, aut scutorum, aut lancearum, sole radiante, ferre poterat intuitum?". Cf. *The Song of Roland*, laisses 79, 80, 82.

[566] Cf. GF x (22).

[567] On the requirement to monasteries, see Bouchard 1987, 23–29, 46–67; Lawrence 1989, 36–38; and its bearings on crusading, Bull 1993, 115–154. On the relationship of monasteries and their lay patrons, see Bouchard 1987, passim.

[568] Ward 2000, 78–79, wrote that "So closely linked, indeed, were the different branches of aristocratic families in our period [the high Middle Ages] that it might well be asked whether both monastic and secular clerical historians do not reflect simply the prevailing aristocratic *mores* of the day." Although that I do not believe that the histories written by clerics or monks can "reflect" the knightly world as such, it is important to realise that the ecclesiastics were truly familiar with this world. On this, see Shopkow 1997, 217, 246; Kaeuper 2009, 10–11; Packard 2011, 56–57.

Moreover, the fundamental factor for why we have written records of vernacular poetry in the first place is that the *litterati*, i.e. the ecclesiastics, were increasingly keen to compile them.[569] Guibert had indeed spent his first twelve years in a military community at Clermont.[570]

What then are the implications of these stylistic decisions? The notion that Robert's narrative shares various similarities with the *chansons* would suggest that he was familiar with the popular literary (or more probably oral) tradition, and that he deliberately drew on it when he was rewriting the history of the crusade. But why would he do that? Could it be that he elaborated and invented all these heroic episodes only for the amusement of the literate audiences?[571] Given that his chronicle was without a doubt the most widely copied and distributed of the first-crusade narratives, that would hardly be the case. It is likely that this success did not come by accident. The reasons for this can be understood when we compare the narrative with Guibert's version.

As already mentioned, Guibert devoted several pages for recording the noble lineages and the achievements of the important characters of the story. For instance, among the disorderly composed discussions in his seventh book, there is a lengthy record of of Godfrey's achievements. In this passage, Guibert relates with detail how Godfrey wrestled with a bear, receiving a wound that was almost mortal.[572] Yet, despite of his frequent usage of different metres, nowhere does he achieve such vividness and crimson coloured imagery that is present in many parts of Robert's narration. Could it thus be that he was merely ignorant or indifferent of the contemporary popular poetry? This seems unlikely, for there are many reminiscences of the *chansons* in his narrative as well. For example, the following passage is greatly suggestive in this respect:

> The battle turned into victory, and many sharp spears shattered in the bodies of those who had turned their backs to flee. The enemy's shields were battered by long ash wood lances that were struck with such force that they dwindled into slivers. No helmet prevented a head struck by the edges of the crusaders' swords from being wounded; and they found the stitching of their so-called impenetrable cuirasses too fragile. Armour protected no part of the body; whatever the barbarians thought firm was weak; whatever the Franks touched, shattered. The field was covered with innumerable corpses, and the thick pile of dead men disturbed the evenness of the grassy field. Everywhere the earth,

[569] Brault 1978, 5 n. 22; Bloch 1982, 95–96.
[570] Benton 1970, 22.
[571] Ward 2000, 84, suggests that the monastic interest in the secular epic is "in some senses…merely a result of the common mentality". If this was the only reason, how then could one explain the differencies between the chroniclers discussing the same subject? Is it that some just share "the mentality" and the others do not?
[572] GN VII.xii.

sprinkled with the hateful blood of Gentiles, grew dark.[573]

The elements of the *chansons* are clearly present: the deadly weapons, fragility of the enemy armour before the fierce heroes, and the blood that follows the encounter. Yet, what is different in regard to Robert's narration is the style. Here the text is captivating, yet in other parts one cannot but wonder if it was ever read aloud. In some parts, Guibert's narration is more like a free discussion than a coherent story. Constantly, he bounces from a topic to another, adds digressions and commentaries between, and dwells deep on labyrinthine exegesis. The very structure of his narrative goes against the oral nature of the contemporary literature: he begins the chronicle with a lengthy discussion about the background of the crusade, which fills whole of his first book, and concludes the story with a fairly incoherent seventh book that contains lengthy debate with Fulcher's interpretations as well as numerous flashbacks into the previous events.[574] This non-orality is manifested also by the relatively difficult and extravagant language of his narration, which can only have been fully understood by the most learned of the readers. This would suggest that Guibert thought only an educated audience when he wrote his chronicle. One should note, however, how much the ecclesiastic elite seems to have enjoyed the descriptive stories of battles.

The nature of Guibert's intended audience is further illustrated by some particular passages in his narrative. In his first book, Guibert gives us a bizarre description of Islam and its origins, which he claims to have heard from some "skilful speakers".[575] According to Guibert, Mohammad established his doctrine by deviating from the "belief in the Son and the Holy Spirit" and insisting that God was indivisible.[576] Guibert pictures him as a trickster and a fraud who, having first made a pact with the devil, perverted the doctrine of Christianity so that all the Christian vices were turned into virtues. Furthermore, Guibert claims that Mohammad was an epileptic, a feature that contributed to his success as a false prophet. Eventually he also died in

[573] "Mutantur bella tropheis atque terga vertentium illisa corporibus multipliciter rasilis hasta confringitur, fraxinos creberrime longas hostilis excipit umbo et, magnis impactae viribus, per nimietates ictuum in hastulas minutantur, galea mucronibus obiecta occipitium non defendit a vulnere, loricarum, ut putabant impenetrabilium, pretextiones tenuitatis accusant: nullis corporum partibus munimenta profuerant, quicquid tutum barbari iudicant infirmatur, quicquid Franci tetigere conscindunt. Sternitur campestris superficies numerositate cadaverum et crebra mortuorum congeries graminosi pridem ruris exasperat equor, inviso ubique terra gentilium cruore respersa nigrescit." GN IV.iv.230–241.

[574] Similar factors might have been behind the unpopularity of Orderic Vitalis' *Historia ecclesiastica*. See Shopkow 1997, 234.

[575] "…quae a quibusdam disertioribus dici vulgo audierim…" I.iii.254.

[576] "…qui quondam eos a Filii et Spiritus sancti prorsus credulitate diduxerit, solius Patris personae quasi deo uni et creatori inniti docuerit, Iesum purum hominem dixerit et, ut breviter eius dogma concludam, circumcisione quidem decreta totius eis impudicitiae laxavit habenas." GN I.iii.245–250.

one of his fits. Then, after his demise, some pigs came at his corpse and started to devour on the body. Here Guibert gives his opinion of the incident: "While the true Stoics, that is, the worshipers of Christ, killed Epicurus, lo, the greatest law-giver tried to revive the pig, in fact he did revive it, and as a pig himself, he lay exposed to be eaten by pigs, so that the master of filth appropriately died a filthy death."[577] After this shuddering piece of satire, Guibert provides a mock poem, which is a modification of one of Horace's famous odes. [578] Finally, he concludes that "He who has lived by the pig is chewed to death by the pig and the limbs which were called blessed have become pigs' excrement. May those who wish to honour him carry their mouths his heels, which the pig has poured forth in stench", making thus an obvious allusion to the Biblical parable "he who lives by the sword, dies by the sword".[579]

Surely, this story would not have been of much interest for a laic audience. Neither would they have understood its delicate allusions.[580] Yet, even if this piece of humour could be disputed, the same cannot be said about Guibert's frequent and lengthy discussions of exegesis. As an illustrative example of this, we can take the account of the papal sermon in Clermont. Whereas in Robert's account, the pope directed his speech to those who God had given "the outstanding glory in arms, greatness of spirit, fitness of body and the strength to humiliate the *hairy scalp* of those who resist" them, [581] in Guibert's version, the main part of the sermon consists of several enthymemes which argue for the religious importance of Constantinople and Jerusalem.[582] Moreover, he clarifies that the reason why the Antichrist would assail the Christians and not the Gentiles is derived from the "etymology of his name".[583] Then he goes on to explain the specific sense of understanding "the times of nations".[584]

---

[577] "Ecce legifer optimus dum Epicureum, quem veri Stoici, Christi scilicet cultores, occiderant, porcum resuscitare molitur, immo prorsus resuscitat, porcus ipse porcis devorandus exponitur, ut obscenitatis magisterium obscenissimo, uti convenit, fine concludat." GN I.iv.387–391.

[578] "*aere per*hennius *regalique situ pyramidum altius*, ut vir egregius, omni iam porco felicior, cum poeta eodem dicere valeat: *non omnis moriar, multaque pars mei vitabit Libitinam*." GN I.iv.394–396; Horace, *Carminum* III.xxx.1–2, 6–7.

[579] "Manditur ore suum qui porcum vixerat, huius/ membra beata cluunt, podice fusa suum./ Cum talos ori, tum quod sus fudit odori/ digno qui celebrat cultor honore ferat." GN I.iv.398–401; cf. Matthaeus 26:52. Levine's translation in prosimetre, modified only in order to standardise the spelling.

[580] For a thorough analysis of this passage, the satiric sense of humour, and the classical allusions, see Levine 1989, 261–273.

[581] "Quibus…nisi vobis, quibus prae ceteris gentibus contulit Deus insigne decus armorum, magnitudinem animorum, agilitatem corporum, virtutem humiliandi *verticem capilli* vobis resistentium?" RM I.i (728b); Psalmi 67:22. Sweetenham's translation.

[582] GN II.iv. See the discussion in Chapter 2.2.

[583] "Perspicuum namque est Antichristum non contra Iudeos, non contra gentiles bella facturum, sed iuxta ethimologiam sui nominis Christianos pervasurum..." GN II.iv.185–188. For this etymological topos (*notatio*), see Cicero, *Topica* ii.10, viii.35–37.

[584] GN II.iv.208–.

In his preaching manual, Guibert wrote that the preacher should consider that "though he preaches simple and uncomplicated matter to the unlettered, at the same time he should try to reach a higher plane with the educated; let him offer to them what they are capable of understanding".[585] In his crusade narrative, Guibert seems to have followed this guideline. If, however, Guibert (or Urban) had addressed this kind of speech to lay audience, the response would most likely not have been very enthusiastic.[586] Furthermore, although obviously interested in the noble families and their standings, Guibert, rather inconsistently, denied the importance of "honours and possessions" of those "great princes" whom he, on the other hand, so devotedly described.[587] In my opinion, this conflict is due to his decision to write for those whom he imagined to be more responsive to theological arguments supporting the crusade than an acclamation of secular values. Exactly the opposite, then, seems to be true for Robert who is notably cautious to impose the monastic values or to reproach the knightly way of life. Instead, he makes the most of the epic heroism, so that the crusade is portrayed as a kind of epic *chanson*.

One might ask why Robert did not use vernacular but wrote in Latin instead. Yet, in the early twelfth century, Latin was the equivalent of literacy; the vernacular became common during the century but only in verse – thus practically all the prose was in Latin until the thirteenth century.[588] Moreover, it is likely that the dignity of the subject required the use of Latin. Finally, Latin was also the most widely read language in Europe. And, as the subject of crusading was not only a French one but one that had a wide support all over Christendom, Latin was the obvious choice in order to obtain the widest possible circulation for the narrative. All the literates were bilingual, and some of them committed vernacular poetry to writing. For Robert, the choice and ability to imbue his narrative with heroic imagery enabled him to disseminate his interpretation of the crusade far more effectively and widely than it would have been if he had held only to classical or biblical tradition.

---

[585] "...dum illitteratis levia et plana pradicat, litteratis etiam quae sibi conveniant sublimiora aliqua interemiscere studeat, et dum his quae capacitati suae placeant propinat, ita explicet…" Guibert of Nogent, *liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*, 4 (col. 25). Miller's translation.

[586] Thus I argue exactly the opposite of what Cole 1991, 33, has suggested. She wrote that Guibert "…was better equipped to give effective expression to what he knew, and that of all the versions, his demonstrates best how Urban succeeded in touching the bedrock of the Frankish soul, animating it with the desire to serve God." In my opinion, Guibert did not even aim for this, yet it was Robert who tried to and succeeded in moving the hearts of knightly classes.

[587] "De honoribus possessionibusque reticeo, quae quidem extra nos sunt..." GN II.xv.715–716.

[588] Blacker 1994, p. xii n. 6. On the vernacular prose, see also Ainsworth 2003, 411–415.

5. Conclusion

Some modern scholars have regarded the First Crusade as a deliberate scheme of the reformer papacy and its monastic supporters to turn the western society into a *Societas Christiana*, which was ultimately led by the Church.[589] Others again have argued that the crusade was a movement that was instigated in order to transfer the violent energies of knightly classes into a foreign territory, thus pacifying and uniting the Christendom.[590] To me, the problem of these kinds of conclusions seems to be that they do not differentiate enough between their sources. For example, both of these themes are quite prominent in all the Benedictine narratives, yet these later interpretations tell us little about the actual reasons of the expedition. Yet, as few letters and the charter evidence are simply not enough to reconstruct the crusade, we must rely on the rich narrative accounts about the expedition.

In the present study, I have tried to demonstrate how a particular narrative record of the First Crusade was reworked into three different versions. All these are strikingly similar in several aspects. First, they all promote the papal authority over the crusade and describe the expedition as a legitimate retribution of God through the crusaders. Moreover, most of the subjects discussed in this study contribute to a harmonious picture of the crusade: an expedition, initiated by the vicar of Apostle Peter on behalf of God himself, and carried out unanimously by the Franks as the chosen people; an army that was disciplined and unanimous, although combined of various ethnic groups from different locations; and an objective which was driven by both the collective zeal for vengeance and the aspiration for personal salvation. All this suggests that the authors aimed to raise the crusading enthusiasm among their audiences by uniting the Christendom against a common enemy. At the same time, this image worked to support the reformer papacy who was contesting with the leaders of the secular world about the limits of its power.

Not all the promoted features in the narratives were similar, though. For example, whereas Guibert made the most out of the nationalistic praise of Frenchness, Baldric tried to describe the crusade as a movement of unified Christians combined of various people who shared the same military identity of *Franci*. Robert, on the other hand, was clearly cautious in reproaching the predominant knightly culture and took care to not to promote too a monkish picture of the crusaders. It is clear, however, that all the Benedictines more or less sought to promote a new way of being knight – one

[589] See, for example, Menache 1990, 99.
[590] Especially, Mastnak 2002.

that was religiously and morally acceptable. This ideal was more developed but not controversial to the implicit ideal already in the *Gesta*. One of the common features between all these narratives was the novel idea of spiritually rewarding warfare. No more was it necessary to retire into a cloister in order to achieve "some measure of God's grace" by one's own efforts, as Guibert aptly expressed it.[591] This craving for salvation, implied in all the texts, was not merely a subject of clerical propaganda, but also a genuine spiritual concern, as can be seen in the fact that the call for crusade achieved such popularity among the laity.[592] Furthermore, the notion that clerics constantly brought up the sinfulness of secular warfare and appealed to the contrition of their audience implicates that the message was commonly esteemed important – otherwise it would hardly be worth invoking for. Therefore, especially before the later system of indulgences, crusading was truly a potential option for laics, if they were to unburden their load of sins.[593] It provided the belligerent classes a possibility to combine their occupation with spiritual salvation. This is why the ideal of *miles Christi* was so widely embraced among the knights, and it is also this element that the Benedictines sought to promote. Yet, they had to remould it slightly in order to get it accepted among the audience that was more critical towards the novel fusion of pilgrim and warrior.

In this regard, an important question remains unanswered: to what extent was the Benedictine emphasis on morally ideal warrior related to the prevalent reformatory endeavour to define and control the behaviour of Christians? Should we consider these three narratives of the First Crusade as part of a deliberate agenda of creating a Christian knight? Be as it may, this emphasis remained short lived, as the later narratives on the crusades did not encompass so prominent image of a quasi-monastic movement.[594] To some extent, the vanishing of this feature from the later narratives might stem from the fact that, by then, the ideal of a Christian knight had already been realised. Partly, the monastic ideal became true in the form of religious military orders, like Knights Templar. On the other hand, the ideal was also imbibed and further moulded in the rising ethos of secular chivalry.[595]

To a certain degree, the differences between the chronicles stem from their dissimilar intended audiences. In my opinion, Guibert's narrative was undoubtedly

[591] "...sub consueta licentia et habitu ex suo ipsorum officio dei aliquatenus gratiam consequerentur..."GN I.i.72–73.
[592] For the response of laymen, see Bull 1993, 150–288; and more concisely Bull 2008, 42–62.
[593] Mayer 1988, 36.
[594] Packard 2011, 47.
[595] On this, see Kaeuper 2011.

written for an educated elite. This is concluded by analysing the content, style, and the overal structure of the chronicle. Robert, on the other hand, seems to have reached for a wider audience. For this purpose, he created a heroic epic of the expedition. We know that his version was used in the later epic poetry. Also in the *Song of Roland*, there is an allusion to an unknown chronicle, which suggests that the composers habitually made use of historical material.[596] It is thus possible that Robert intentionally wrote also for later troubadours, which would then use the material in their songs.

During the analysis, I have not written much about the intended audiences of Baldric's narrative. This is because I have found little material from which to argue. Baldric's text was obviously written with oral performance in mind. The language is rhetorically elegant, yet easy to follow. His interpretations are heavy with moral instructions, and he reproaches the secular values without a second thought. It is clear then that he chose an approach that was different from that of Robert's. But what exactly was his audience? It is probable that Baldric wrote solely for the monastic community, as was the common practice.[597] In fact, according to Roger Ray, Orderic Vitalis preferred Baldric's narrative as a source for his *Historia ecclesiastica* because it was more suitable for his intentions of providing material for the monastic *lectio* than Fulcher's version.[598] However, without further evidence, we cannot know whether or not Baldric had similar intentions.

One of the main arguments of the present study is that we have to analyse and compare the narratives without an obsession with factuality. By focusing on the chronicles that based their narration mainly on one and the same source, it has been possible to discern those parts of the original that were altered and those that were accepted by the three rewriters. This approach has furthermore provided an excursion to the early-twelfth-century historiography. Two notions regarding the medieval historiographical practice have thus been confirmed. Firstly, that the past and all the narrations of it were open to discussion. Although the authors considered themselves as telling the truth, they obviously acknowledged that the texts were going to be disputed, altered, and refuted by later copyists and adaptors alike. However, the veracity of these interpretations was not defined by the modern criteria. Consequently, the authors did not

---

[596] *The Song of Roland*, 1443.
[597] One should note that Baldric addresses his audience as *fratres carissimi*. See prologus (9).
[598] Ray 1976, 56. See also Shopkow 1997, 255, who notes that Orderic's text was not divided into numbered chapters, as was the established practice within the institutionalised reading. Neither was Baldric's narrative. Against this, it is noteworthy that Robert's version is split up into very brief subchapters, which implies the oral usage of his chronicle. The division was not necessarily original though. See Sweetenham 2005, 101 n. 1, 69; and the discussion in page 57 above.

make a significant distinction between history and fiction.

Ultimately the only factor that makes a difference between, for example, Lancelot and Bohemond is that there are various texts which in a way or another argue for the existence of the latter character. Therefore, it is likely that there truly was a historical person which these texts refer to. Yet, the nature of this person and his exact role on the crusade is disclosed to us only by various and different stories. These stories were not written in order to report what truly happened, but how things ought to be. The factual basis behind Bohemond's character and his deeds is thus impossible to reach. Hence, the modern scholars should not hold to an excessively strict definition of a fact. For, much has been written about the actual events and the ideas of crusaders, yet, critically thinking, we know little more about the crusades than we do about the historical basis of the Gospel. This does not mean that we could not use medieval chronicles as historical sources. Yet, we have to acknowledge the nature of these writings: that they are stories written in order to legitimise the present, not to describe the past as such. Consequently, it is utterly misleading to examine historical literature through the modern perception of factuality. Instead, one should consider histories as they were written: stories about the past – nothing more, nothing less.

6. Bibliography

ABBREVIATIONS

RHC Occ. *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux.* Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, Paris 1841–1906.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Albert of Aachen. *Historia Ierosolimitana: History of the Journey to Jerusalem.* Ed. & transl. Susan Edgington. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007. [AA]
See also an earlier edition in RHC Occ. vol. 4, pp. 265–713.

Baldric of Bourgueil. *Historia Jerosolimitana*. RHC Occ. vol. 4, pp. 1–111. [BB]
Parts of the chronicle are translated by August C. Krey in *The First Crusade. The Accounts of Eye-Witnesses and Participants*. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1921.

———— . *Les oevres poetiques de Baudri de Bourgueil (1046–1130)*. Édition critique publiée d'après le manuscrit du Vatican. Thèse présentée pour le Doctorat de l'Université de Paris par Phyllis Abrahams. Librairie ancienne honoré champion, Paris 1926.

Bernard of Clairvaux. "Liber ad milites templi de laude novae militiae" – *Sancti Bernardi opera vol. 3. Tractatus et opuscula*. Ad fidem codicum recensuerunt J. Leclercq & H. M. Rochais. Editiones Cistercienses, Roma 1963. pp. 205–239. [BC]
Translation: *The Templars. Selected sources translated and annotated by Malcom Barber and Keith Bate*. Mancherster Medieval Sources Series. Manchester University Press, Manchester 2002. pp. 215–227.

Biblia Sacra juxta Vulgatam Clementinam. Editio electronica. Based primarily on the edition of Colunga-Turrado (1947) and secondarily on Vercellone (1861). Ed. M. Tweedale, 2005. http://vulsearch.sf.net.
Translation: *The Douay-Rheims Bible*. Printed by John Murphy Company, Baltimore 1899. Electronic version produced by OCR, proof-read and corrected by John Houston.

Cicero. *De inventione*. The Loeb Classical Library. Cicero vol. 2. With an English translation by H. M. Hubbell. Harvard University Press & William Heinemann Ltd, London 1976. pp. 1–345.

———— . *De oratore*. The Loeb Classical Library. Cicero vol. 3. With an English

translation by E. W. Sutton. William Heinemann & Harvard University Press, London 1957.

———— . *Topica*. The Loeb Classical Library. Cicero vol. 2. With an English translation by H. M. Hubbell. Harvard University Press & William Heinemann Ltd, London 1976. pp. 377–459.

Epistulae et chartae ad historiam primi belli sacri spectantes quae supersunt aevo aequales ac genvinae. Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088–1100. Eine Guellensammlung zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges. Mit Erläuterungen Herausgegeben von Heinrich Hagenmeyer. Innsbruck 1901.

Fulcher of Chartres. *Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127).* Mit Erläuterungen und einem Anhange herausgegeben von Heinrich Hagenmeyer. Heidelberg 1913.
Earlier edition: RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. 311–485. [FC]
Translated as *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095–1127* by Frances Rita Ryan. Ed. Harold S. Fink. Norton & Company, New York 1973 (1969).

Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum: *The Deeds of The Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*. Ed. & transl. Rosalind Hill with Roger Mynors. Nelson & Sons, London 1962. [GF]
Earlier edition: *Anonymi gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum.* Mit Erläuterungen herausgegeben von Heinrich Hagenmeyer. Heidelberg 1890.

Guibert of Nogent. *Historia quae inscribitur Dei gesta per Francos*. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis CXXVII A. Ed. R. B. C. Huygens. Brepols, Turnhout 1996. [GN]
Earlier edition: RHC Occ. vol. 4, pp. 113–263.
Translated as *The Deeds of God through the Franks* by Robert Levine. Echo Library, Teddington 2008 (1997).

———— . *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*. Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina, vol. 156, col. 21–32.
Translated as “A Book about the Way a Sermon Ought to be Given” by Joseph M. Miller – *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*. Ed. Joseph M. Miller et al. Indiana University Press, Bloomington 1973. pp. 162–181.

Horace. *Ars poetica*. Quintus Horatius Flaccus recensuit atque interpretatus est Ionannes Gaspar Orellius. Editio quarta maior emendata et aucta post Ioannem Georgium Baiterum. Curavit volumen alterum Wilhelmus Mewes. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim 1972 (1892). pp. 563–649.

———— . *Carminum*. Quintus Horatius Flaccus recensuit atque interpretatus est

Ioannes Gaspar Orellius. Editio quarta maior emendata et aucta quam post Ioannem Georgium Baiterum. Curavit volumen prius Guilelmus Hirschfelder. Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim 1972 (1886).

Tudebode, Peter. *Historia de Hierosolimitano itinere*. RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. 1–117. [PT]
Translated with the same name by John H. Hill and Laurita L. Hill.
The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1974.

Plato. *Gorgias*. Plato in Twelve Volumes, vol. 3. Translated by W. R. M. Lamb. William Heinemann & Harvard University Press, London 1967.
Electronic edition: www.perseus.tufts.edu.

Raymond of Aguilers. *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*. [RA]
RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. 231–309. Translated with the same name by John H. Hill & Laurita L. Hill. The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1968.

Rhetorica ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium). The Loeb Classical Library. With an English Translation by Harry Caplan. William Heinemann & Harvard University Press, London 1954.

Robert the Monk. *Historia Iherosolimitana*. RHC Occ. vol. 3, pp. 717–882. [RM]
Translated as *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade* by Carol Sweetenham. Crusade Texts in Translation 11. Ashgate, Aldershot 2005.

The Song of Roland. An Analytical Edition. 2 volumes. Ed. & transl. Gerard J. Brault. The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park 1978.
Digitalised version of the Oxford manuscript at:
http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet.

LITERATURE

Ainsworth, Peter. “Legendary History: *Historia* and Fabula” – *Historiography in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Deborah & Mauskopf & Deliyannis. Brill, Leiden 2003. pp. 387–416.

Albu, Emily. *The Normans in Their Histories: Propaganda, Myth And Subversion*. The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2001.

Archambault, Paul J. *A Monk’s Confession: The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent*. Transl. Paul J. Archambault. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park 1996.

Ashby-Beach, Genette. *The Song of Roland: A Generative Study of the Formulaic Language in the Single Combat*. Rodopi, Amsterdam 1985.

Auerbach, Erich. *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*. Transl. Ralph Manheim. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1965.

(Literatursprache und Publikum in der lateinischen Spätantike und im Mittelalter, 1958)

Baldwin, Marshall W. (ed.) *A History of the Crusades. Volume 1: The First Hundred Years*. General editor: Kenneth M. Setton. Second edition. The University of Wisconsin Press, Wisconsin 1969 (1955).

Barber, Malcom. *The New Knighthood. A History of the Order of the Temple*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994.

Barber, Richard & Barker, Juliet. *Tournaments. Jousts, Chivalry and Pageants in the Middle Ages.* The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 1989.

Benton, John F. *Self and Society in Medieval France: The Memoirs of Abbot Guibert of Nogent (1064?–c.1125)*. Ed. John F. Benton, transl. C. C. Swinton Bland (revised). Harper & Row, New York 1970.

Blake, E. O. "The Formation of the 'Crusade Idea'" Reprinted in *The Crusades. Critical Concepts in Historical Studies. Volume 1*. Ed. Andrew Jotischky. Routledge, Abingdon 2008. pp. 19–16. (Originally published in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 21, 1970)

Blacker, Jean. *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman* Regnum. University of Texas Press, Austin 1994.

Bloch, Marc. *Feudal Society*. Second edition. 2 volumes. Transl. L. A. Manyon. Routledge, London 1982 (1961).

Booth, Wayne C. "Resurrection of the Implied Author: Why Bother?" – *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Ed. James Phelan & Peter J. Rabinowitz. Blackwell Publishing, Malden 2005. pp. 75–88.

Bouchard, Constance B. *Sword, Miter, and Cloister. Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198*. Connell University Press, Ithaca 1987.

Boulton, D'A. J. D. "Classic Knighthood as Nobiliary Dignity: The Knighting of Counts and Kings' Sons in England, 1066–1272" – *Medieval knighthood V: Papers from the Sixth Straberry Hill Conference, 1994*. Ed. Stephen Church & Ruth Harvey. Boydell Press, Woodbridge 1995. pp. 41–100.

Brault, Gerard J. *The Song of Roland. An Analytical Edition*. Volume I: Introduction and Commentary. The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park 1978.

Bréhier, Louis. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum: Histoire anonyme de la première Croisade*. Ed. & transl. Louis Bréhier. Honoré Champion, 1924.

Brundage, James A. “Crusades, Clerics and Violence: Reflections on a Canonical Theme” – *The Experience of Crusading. Volume 1: Western Approaches*. Ed. Marcus Bull & Norman Housley. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003. pp. 147–156.

———— . *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1987.

Bull, Marcus (ed). *France in the Central Middle Ages*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2002.

———— . “Capetian Monarchy and the Early Crusade Movement: Hugh of Vermandois and Louis II” – *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, vol. 40, 1996. pp. 25–46.

———— . “Overlapping and Competing Identities in the Frankish First Crusade” – *Le concile de Clermont de 1095 et l’appel à la Croisade : actes du Colloque Universitaire International de Clermont-Ferrand (23–25 juin 1995) / organisé et publié avec le concours du Conseil Régional d’Auvergne*. École française de Rome 1997. pp. 195–211.

———— . *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade. The Limousin and Gascony c.970–c.1130*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1993.

———— . “The Roots of Lay Enthusiasm for the First Crusade” Reprinted in *The Crusades. Concepts in Historical Studies. Volume 1*. Ed. Andrew Jotischky. Routledge, Abingdon 2008. pp. 42–62. (Originally published in History 78, 1993)

Burstein, Eitan. “Quelques remarques sur le vocabulaire de Guibert de Nogent” – *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, X^e–XII^e siècles*, vol. 83, 1978. pp. 247–263.

du Cange, Carolus. *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis*. Editio nova. Imprimeuréditeur: Léopold Favre. Niort 1883–1887.

Caplan, Harry. “The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching” – *Speculum*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1929. pp. 282–290.

Chaurand, Jacques. “La conception de l’histoire de Guibert de Nogent (1053–1124)” – *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale, X^e–XII^e siècles*, vol. 31–32, 1965. pp. 381–395.

Clanchy, M. T. *From Memory to Written Record. England 1066–1307*. Second edition. Blackwell, Oxford 1993 (1979).

Classen, Peter. “*Res Gestae*, Universal History, Apocalypse: Visions of Past and Future” – *Renaissance and Renewal in Twelfth Century*. Ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles

Constable with Carol D. Lanham. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1982. pp. 387–417.

Cole, Penny J. "'O God, The Heathen Have Come into Your Inheritance' (Ps. 78.1). The Theme of Religious Pollution in Crusade Documents, 1095–1188 – *Crusaders and Muslims in Twelfth-Century Syria*. Ed. Maya Shatzmiller. E. J. Brill, Leiden 1993.

———— . *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270*. Medieval Academy Books, No. 96. The Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge 1991.

Coleman, Janet. *Ancient and Medieval Memories. Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992.

Constable, Giles. *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century*. Ashgate, Franham 2008.

Cowdrey, H. E. J. "Christianity and the Morality of Warfare During the First Century of Crusading" – *The Experience of Crusading. Volume 1: Western Approaches*. Ed. Marcus Bull & Norman Housley. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003. pp. 175–192.

———— . "Pope Urban II's preaching of the First Crusade". Reprinted in *The Crusades. Critical Concepts in Historical Studies. Volume 2*. Ed. Andrew Jotischky. Routledge, Abingdon 2008. pp. 3–16. (Originally published in History 55, 1970)

———— . *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1970 (a).

———— . "The Peace and the Truce of God in the Eleventh Century" – *Past & Present*, vol. 46, 1970 (b). pp. 42–67.

Crouch, David. *Tournament*. Palgrave Macmillan, Hambledon 2005.

Deborah & Mauskopf & Deliyannis (ed). *Historiography in the Middle Ages*. Brill, Leiden 2003.

Dumville, D. "What is a Chronicle" – *The Medieval Chronicle II.* Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrecht 16–21 July 1999. Rodopi, Amsterdam 2002. pp. 1–27.

Edgington, Susan. "Albert of Aachen Reappraised" – *From Clermont to Jerusalem: the Crusades and Crusader Societies, 1095–1500*. Selected proceedings of the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 10–13 July 1995. Ed. Alan V. Murray. Brepols, Turnhout 1998. pp. 55–67.

Edgington, Susan B. & Sweetenham, Carol. *The Chanson d'Antioche. An Old French Account of the First Crusade*. Ashgate, Farnham 2011.

Elliott, Dyan. "Pollution, Illusion and Masculine Disarray: Nocturnal Emissions and the

Sexuality of the Clergy" – *Constructing Medieval Sexuality*. Ed. Karma Lochrie et al. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 1997. pp. 1–23.

Epp, Verena. *Fulcher von Chartres. Studien zur Geschichtsschreibung des ersten Kreuzzuges*. Droste Verlag, Düsseldorf 1990.

Erdmann, Carl. *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*. Transl. Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1977. (Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens, 1935)

Fink, Harold S. *Fulcher of Charters. A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem, 1095–1127*. Transl. Frances Rita Ryan. Ed. Harold S. Fink. Norton & Company, New York 1973 (1969).

Flori, Jean. "De l'anonyme Normand à Tudebode et aux Gesta Francorum. L'impact de la propagande de Bohémond sur la critique textuelle des sources de la première croisade." – *Revue d´histoire ecclésiastique*, vol. 102, issue 3–4, 2007. pp. 717–746.

———— . *Croisade et chevalerie, XI^e–XII^e siècles*. De Boeck & Larcier s.a., Paris 1998.

France, John. "The Anonymous *Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem* of Raymond of Aguilers and the *Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere* of Peter Tudebode: An Analysis of the Textual Relationship between Primary Sources for the First Crusade" – *The Crusades and their Sources. Essays presented to Bernard Hamilton*. Ed. John France & William G. Zajak. Ashgate, Aldershot 1998 (a). pp. 39–69.

———— . "The Use of Anonymous Gesta Francorum in the Early Twelfth-Century Sources for the First Crusade" – *From Clermont to Jerusalem: the Crusades and Crusaders Societies, 1095–1500*. Selected proceedings of the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 10–13 July 1995. Ed by Alan V. Murray. Brepols, Turnhout 1998 (b). pp. 29–42.

———— . *Victory in the East. A Military History of the First Crusade*. Cambridge University, Cambridge 1994.

Frankopan, Peter. "Co-operation between Constantinople and Rome before the First Crusade: a Study of the Convergence of Interests in Croatia in the late Eleventh Century" – *Crusades*, vol. 3, 2004. pp. 1–13.

Gavigan, John. "The Syntax of the *Gesta Francorum*" – *Language*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1943. Language Dissertation No. 37. pp. 10–102.

Hagenmeyer, Heinrich. *Anonymi Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosoilymitanorum*.

Heidelberg 1890.

———— . *Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia Hierosolymitana (1095–1127).* Heidelberg 1913.

Hallam, Elizabeth M. *Capetian France, 987–1328*. Longman, London 1980.

Harari, Noah Y. “Eyewitnessing in Accounts of the First Crusade: the *Gesta Francorum* and Other Contemporary Narratives” – *Crusades*, vol. 3, 2004. pp. 77–99.

Hardie, Philip. “Narrative Epic” – *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Ed. Stephen Harrison. Blackwell Publishing, Padstow 2005. pp. 83–100.

Head, Thomas & Landes, Richard (ed.). *The Peace of God. Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca 1992.

Hill, Rosalind. *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*: *The Deeds of The Franks and the other Pilgrims to Jerusalem*. Ed. & transl. Rosalind Hill with Roger Mynors. Nelson & Sons, London 1962.

Hill, John & Hill, Laurita. *Peter Tudebode. Historia de Hierosolymitano Itinere*. Transl. with introduction and notes by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill. The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1974.

———— . *Raymond D’Aguilers. Historia Francorum qui ceperunt Iherusalem*. Transl. with Introduction and notes by John Hugh Hill and Laurita L. Hill. The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1968.

Hodgson, Natasha. “The Role of Kerbogha’s Mother in the *Gesta Francorum* and Selected Chronicles of the First Crusade” – *Gendering the Crusades*. Ed. Edgington & Lambert. University of Wales Press, Cardiff 2001. pp. 163–176.

Holt, Andrew. “Feminine Sexuality and the Crusades. Clerical Opposition to Women as a Strategy for Crusading Success” – *Sexuality in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Times. New Approaches to a Fundamental Cultural-Historical and Literary-Anthropological Theme*. Ed. Albrecht Classen. Walter de Gryter, Berlin 2008. pp. 449–470

Housley, Norman: ”Jerusalem and the Development of the Crusade Idea, 1099–1128” – *Crusading and Warfare in Medieval and Renaissance Europe*. Variorum Collected Studies Series. Ashgate, Aldershot 2001 (1987). pp. 27–40.

Iorga, N. *Les narrateurs de la première croisade*. J. Gamber, Paris 1928.

Irvine, Martin & Thompson, David. “*Grammatica* and literary theory” – *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism vol. 2: the Middle Ages*. Ed. Alaistair Minnis & Ian Johnson. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005. pp. 15–41.

Kaeuper, Richard W. *Holy Warriors. The Religious Ideology of Chivalry*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 2009.

Kangas, Sini. *Deus vult: Images of Crusader Violence, c. 1095–1100*. Doctoral thesis. University of Helsinki 2007 (unpublished).

———— . "The Genesis of an Early Twelfth-Century Crusade Chronicle" – *Methods and the Medievalist: Current Approaches in Medieval Studies*. Ed. By Marko Lamberg et al. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne 2008.

Keen, Maurice. *Chivalry*. Yale University Press, New Haven 2005 (1984).

Knape, Joachim. "*Historia*, Textuality and *Episteme* in the Middle Ages" – *Historia. The Concept and Genres in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen & Päivi Mehtonen. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 116. Societas Scientiarum Fennica 2000. pp. 11–27.

Kraft, Friedrich. *Heinrich Steinhöwels Verdeutschung der Historia Hierosolmitana des Robertus Monachus. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung*. Dissertation. Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, Strasbourg 1905.

Lawrence, C. H. *Medieval Monasticism. Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages*. Second Edition. Longman, London 1989 (1984).

Leclercq, Armelle. "Vers et prose, le jeu de la forme melee dans les *Dei gesta per Francos* de Guibert de Nogent (XII^{e} siecle)" – *The Medieval Chronicle III.* Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Doorn/Utrecht 12–18 July 2002. Ed. Erik Kooper. Rodopi, Amsterdam 2004. pp. 101–115.

Le Jan, Régine. "Continuity and Change in the Tenth-Century Nobility" – *Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe: Concepts, Origins, Transformations*. Ed. Anne J. Duggan. Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2007 (2000). pp. 53–68.

Levine, Robert. "Satiric Vulgarity in Guibert de Nogent's *Gesta Dei per Franos*" – *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, vol. 7, no. 3, 1989. pp. 261–273.

———— . *The Deeds of God through the Franks*. Transl. and ed. by Robert Levine. Echo Library, Teddington 2008 (1997).

Lock, Peter (ed.). *The Routledge Companion to the Crusades*. Routledge, London 2006.

de Lubac, Henri. *Medieval Exegesis. Volume I: The Four Senses of Scripture*. Transl. Mark Sebanc. William B. Eerdmands Publishing Company, Grand Rapis 1998. (Exegése médiévale, 1: Les quatre sens de l'écriture, 1959)

MacKinney, Loren C. "The People and Public Opinion in the Eleventh-Century Peace Movement" – *Speculum*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1930. pp. 181–206.

Madden, Thomas F. *A Concise History of the Crusades*. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham 1999.

Markowski, Michael. “Crucesignatus: Its Origins and Early Usage” – *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 10, 1984. pp. 157–164.

Martin, Janet. “Classicism and Style in Latin Literature – *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. From a conference held under the auspices of UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies and Harvard University Committee on Medieval Studies, 26–29 November 1977 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Ed. Benson & Constable with Lanham. Clardendon Press, Oxford 1982. pp. 537–568.

Mastnak, Tomaz. *Crusading Peace: Christendom, the Muslim World, and Western Political Order*. University of California Press, Berkeley 2002.

Mayer, Hans Eberhard. *The Crusades*. Second edition. Transl. John Gillingham. Oxford University Press, Oxford 1988. (Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, 1965)

McKeon, Richard. “Rhetoric in the Middle Ages” – *Speculum*, vol. 17, no. 1, 1942. pp. 1–32.

Menache, Sophia. *The Vox Dei. Communication in the Middle Ages*. Oxford University Press, New York 1990.

Morris, Colin. “Martyrs on the Field of Battle Before and During the First Crusade” – *Martyrs and Martyrologies*. Studies in Church History, vol. 30. Ed. Diana Wood. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford 1993. pp. 93–104.

———— . “Propaganda for War: the Dissemination of the Crusading Ideal in the Twelfth Century” – *The Church and War*. Studies in Church History, vol. 20. Ed. W. J. Sheils. Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1982. pp. 79–101.

———— . *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050 to 1250*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1991.

Munro, Dana C. “The Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095” – *The American Historical Review*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1906. pp. 231–242.

Murphy, James J. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages. A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. University of California Press, Berkeley 1974.

———— . “Western Rhetoric in the Middle Ages” – *Latin Rhetoric and Education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Variorum Collected Studies Series. Ashgate, Aldershot 2005 (1982–1989). pp. 1–26.

Murray, Jacqueline. “Masculinizing Religious Life: Sexual Prowess, the Battle for

Chastity and Monastic Identity" – *Holiness and Masculinity in the Middle Ages*. Ed. P. H. Cullum & Katherine J. Lewis. University of Wales Press, Cardiff 2004. pp. 24–42.

Nelles, William. "Historical and Implied Authors and Readers" – *Comparative Literature*, vol. 45, no. 1, 1993. pp. 22–46.

Nicol, D. M. "Byzantium and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century" Reprinted in *The Crusades. Volume 1*. Critical Concepts in Historical Studies. Ed. Andrew Jotischky. Routledge, Abingdon 2008. pp. 187–206. (Originally published in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 13, 1962)

Packard, Barbara. *Remembering the First Crusade: Latin Narrative Histories 1099–c.1300*. Ph.D. Thesis. Royal Holloway Univesity, London 2011.

Partner, Nancy F. "The New Cornificus: Medieval History and the Artifice of Words" – *Classical Rhetoric & Medieval Historiography*. Ed. Ernst Breisarch. Studies in Medieval Culture XIX. Medieval Institute Publications. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo 1985. pp. 59–165.

Phillips. Jonathan. *The Second Crusade. Extending the Frontiers of Christendom*. Yale University Press, New Haven 2007.

Porges, Walter. "The Clergy, the Poor, and the Non-Combatants on the First Crusade" Reprinted in *The Crusades. Concepts in Historical Studies*. Volume 2. Ed. Andrew Jotischky. Routledge, Abingdon 2008. pp. 30–55. (Originally published in Speculum 21, 1946)

Purkis, William J. *Crusading Spirituality in the Holy Land and Iberia c.1095–c.1187*. The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 2008.

Ray, Roger D. "Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth Century: Problems and Progress of Research" – *Viator: Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, vol. 5, 1974. pp. 33–61

Reeves, Marjorie. "The Bible and Literary Authorship in the Middle Ages" – *Reading the Text: Biblical Criticism and Literary Theory*. Ed. S. Prickett. Oxford 1991. pp. 12–63. (Reprinted in *The Prophetic Sense of History in Medieval and Renaissance Europe*. Ashgate, Aldershot 1999)

Reynolds, Suzanne. *Medieval Reading. Grammar, Rhetoric and the Classical Text*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996.

Rider, Jeff. *God's Scribe. The Historiographical Art of Galbert of Bruges*. The Catholic University Press, Washington D.C. 2001.

Riley-Smith, Jonathan. "Crusading as an Act of Love" – *History*, vol. 65, issue 214,

1980. pp. 177–192.

———— . *The Crusades. A Short History*. The Athlone Press, London 1987.

———— . *The First Crusade and the Idea of Crusading*. Athlone Press, London 1986.

Roberts, Phyllis B. “The *Ars Praedicandi* and the Medieval Sermon” – *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Carolyn Muessig. Brill, Leiden 2002. pp. 41–62.

Robinson, I. S. “Gregory VII and the Soldiers of Christ” – *History*, vol. 58, issue 193, 1973. pp. 169–192.

Rubenstein, Jay. *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind*. Routledge, New York 2002.

———— . “Putting History to Use: Three Crusade Chronicles in Context” – *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, vol. 35, 2004. pp. 131–168

———— . “What is *Gesta Francorum*, and Who Was Peter Tudebode?” – *Revue Mabillon*, nouvelle série 16 (tome 77), 2005. pp. 179–204.

Runciman, Steven. *A History of the Crusades. Volume 1: The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1980 (1951).

Russel, Frederick H. *The Just War in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1975.

Rychner, Jean. *La chanson de geste. Essai sur l’art épique des jongleurs*. Librairie E. Droz, Genève 1955.

Schneidmüller, Bernd. “Constructing Identities of Medieval France” – *France in the Central Middle Ages*. Ed. Marcus Bull. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2002. pp. 15–42.

———— . *Nomen Patriae. Die Entstehung Frankreichs in der politisch-geographisschen Terminologie (10.–13. Jahrhundert)*. Jan Thorbecke Verlag, Sigmaringen 1987.

Shopkow, Leah. *History and Community. Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D.C. 1997.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1952.

Somerville, Robert. *The Councils of Urban II. Volume I: Decreta Claromontensia*. Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum, supplementum I. Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam 1972.

Spiegel, Gabrielle. *The Past as Text. The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography*. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1997.

———— . "Theory into Practice: Reading Medieval Chronicles" – *The Medieval Chronicle.* Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrecht 13–16 July 1996. Ed. Erik Kooper. Rodopi, Amsterdam 1999. pp. 1–12.

Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1983.

Stuckey, Jace. "Charlemagne as Crusader? Memory, Propaganda, and the Many Uses of Charlemagne's Legendary Expedition to Spain" – *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages. Power, Faith, and Crusade*. Ed. Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey. Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2008. pp. 137–152.

Suleiman, Susan & Crosman, Inge (ed.) *The Reader in the Text. Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1980.

Sumption, Jonathan. *Pilgrimage. An Image of Mediaeval Religion*. Faber & Faber, London 1975.

Sweetenham, Carol. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade*: *Historia Iherosolimitana*. Ashgate, Aldershot 2005.

Sweetenham, Carol & Paterson, Linda M. *The Canso d'Antioca. An Occitan Epic Chronicle of the First Crusade*. Ashgate, Aldershot 2003.

Taleb, Nassim Nicholas. *The Black Swan. The Impact of the Highly Improbable*. Random House, New York 2008 (2007).

Trotter, D. A. *Medieval French Literature and the Crusades (1100–1300)*. Librairie Droz s.a., Genève 1988.

Tyerman, Christopher. *God's War. A New History of the Crusades*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge 2006.

Upton-Ward, J. M. *The Rule of the Templars. The French Text of the Rule of the Order of the Knights Templar*. Transl. J. M. Upton-Ward. The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 1992.

Wagner, David L. (ed). *The Seven Liberal Arts in the Middle Ages*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington 1986 (1983).

Ward, John. "Memorializing Dispute Resolution in the Twelfth Century: Annal, History and Chronicle at Vézelay." – *The Medieval Chronicle.* Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrecht 13–16

July 1996. Ed. Erik Kooper. Rodopi, Amsterdam 1999. pp. 269–284.

———— . ”Some Principles of Rhetorical Historiography in the Twelfth Century” – *Classical Rhetoric & Medieval Historiography*. Ed. Ernst Breisarch. Studies in Medieval Culture XIX. Medieval Institute Publications. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo 1985. pp. 103–165.

———— . “The Monastic Historiographical Impulse c. 1000–1260. A Re-Assessment” – *Historia. The Concept ans Genres in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen & Päivi Mehtonen. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 116. Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki 2000. pp. 71–100.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. The John Hopkins, University Press, Baltimore 1973.

Wilson, Daniel. “Readers in Texts” – *PMLA*, vol. 96, no. 5, 1981, pp. 848–863.

Wood, Ian. “Defining the Franks: Frankish Origins in Early Medieval Historiography” – *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Forde, Johnson, and Murray. Leeds Texts and Monographs, New Series 14. University of Leeds, Leeds 1995. pp. 47–57.